

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 962

EA 002 358

Consultant Role Study: Regional Perceptions and Practices,
Regional Curriculum Project, Atlanta, Ga.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education,
Report No-ESEA-Title-5
Pub Date Dec 68

Note-80p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC-\$4.10

Descriptors-Change Agents, *Consultants, Consultation Programs, Educational Improvement, Evaluation,
*Instructional Staff, *Regional Cooperation, *State Departments of Education, *Vocational Education
Teachers

An interview schedule was administered to 180 respondents (116 instructional consultants, seven directors of instructional consultants, 51 vocational consultants, and six directors of vocational consultants) to determine the regional point of view of the consultant role in the six-State area of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Survey data are reported in three sections. Sections 1 and 2 distinguish 11 categories of responses from vocational and instructional consultants, including sources of requests, individuals and groups with whom consultants work, frequency of consultant activities, and evaluation of consultant activities. Section 3 reports responses for all respondents to four categories of open-ended interview data: Satisfying experiences, dissatisfying incidents, drawbacks, and dreams and projections. Findings of the study indicate that the two modus operandi of the instructional and vocational consultants are distinct but that both kinds of consultants consider themselves as change agents and find their work satisfying when they are able to effect change. The report is designed to assist individual State departments of education in their efforts to improve their working relationships with local schools. (JK)

ED030962

OE-BESE
TITLE V

Consultant Role Study -



REGIONAL

PERCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

EA 002 358

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

regional curriculum project

A Cooperative Program for the Study of Instructional Leadership Involving Experimentation in Determining the Role or Roles of State Departments of Education in Facilitating Desirable Change in the Educational Program for Children and Youth. (A Project under Title V, Section 505, Public Law 89-10, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.)

ALABAMA

Dr. Ernest Stone, Superintendent
of Education
Dr. W. M. McCall, Policy Committeeman
Mr. Lee Boone, Coordinator

FLORIDA

Mr. Floyd T. Christian, Superintendent
of Public Instruction
Dr. J. W. Crenshaw, Policy Committeeman
Mr. Marshall Frinks, Coordinator

GEORGIA Administating State

Mr. Jack P. Nix, Superintendent
of Schools
Dr. C. M. Ivie, Policy Committee Chairman
Mr. Albert L. Berry, Coordinator

NORTH CAROLINA

Dr. Charles F. Carroll, Superintendent
of Public Instruction
Mr. Nile F. Hunt, Policy Committeeman
Mrs. Mary L. Evans, Coordinator

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. Cyril B. Busbee, Superintendent
of Education
Dr. Charlie G. Williams, Policy Committeeman
Mr. Frank Kirk, Coordinator

TENNESSEE

Dr. J. Howard Warf, Commissioner
of Education
Dr. John Ed Cox, Policy Committeeman

U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION COORDINATOR: Dr. Jane Franseth

PROJECT STAFF

DIRECTOR: Dr. Edward T. Brown

STATE COORDINATORS

Lee Boone
Marshall Frinks
Albert L. Berry

Alabama
Florida
Georgia

Mary L. Evans
Frank Kirk

North Carolina
South Carolina

RESEARCH: Dr. Ione L. Perry

ARTIST: Mrs. Liz Carmichael Jones

WRITERS: Mrs. Dorothy Hibbert and
Bradley Martin

REGIONAL CURRICULUM PROJECT

156 TRINITY AVENUE, S.W.

ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

PREFACE

The consultant role study was undertaken in the Spring of 1967; it identified the consultants' perception of his role and activities and other information to describe it. The data were returned to each state in a working paper and a regional compilation was prepared for study at inter-state workshops. More recently a narrative report was prepared for each state; its purpose was to present the findings of the study in a more interesting manner.

This report is regional and comparative. It reports the regional mean scores and the mean scores for each state. The commentary directs attention to the differences that exist among the states. None of the comments are, or are meant to be, judgmental; they are meant to raise questions and issues about the character and activities of the consultant role as they vary among the participating states.

The main purpose of this report is to point out the areas and incidents of difference. Follow-up study of them can only occur by using the data provided in the state working papers. Neither this report, nor the individual state narrative reports contains the data necessary for interpretative study. The working paper, then, is a basic document to this report.

States are not identified by name; it is assumed that each state can identify its own data through reference to its working paper.

Edward T. Brown, Director
December, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>	
	<u>Instructional</u>	<u>Vocational</u>
	<u>Division</u>	<u>Division</u>
Introduction	1	
Responses		
Sources of Requests	5	35
With Whom Consultants Work	10	39
Methods of Contact	15	44
Follow-Up Procedures	17	46
Personal Evaluation	19	48
Departmental Evaluation	19	48
Schedule Development	20	50
Frequency of Consultant Activities	21	51
Comparison of Frequency	26	56
Evaluation of Consultant Activities	29	58
Comparison of Evaluation	33	62
Open-Ended Questions		
Satisfying Experiences	65	
Dissatisfying Incidents	67	
Drawbacks	70	
Dreams and Projections	73	
Conclusion	76	

INTRODUCTION

The Regional Curriculum Project, a cooperative activity of the State Departments of Education of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, was formed for the purpose of improving the role the departments play in bringing about change and improvement at the local school level. Funded under Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the RCP isolated three specific areas in which it would concentrate its efforts: the consultant role, the state curriculum guide, and the consultant's use of media. The consultant role was chosen as a particularly important area for study because of the emphasis placed on it in the state departments of education in the southeast. A role study based on personal interviews with consultants in each of the participating departments was to serve as the base of the work in this area.

An interview schedule containing nine sections of structured questions and four open-ended questions was constructed by the project staff and consultants. This schedule was administered to a total of 180 respondents in the region: 116 instructional consultants, 7 directors of instruction consultants, 51 vocational consultants, and 6 directors of vocational consultants. The interviewers in each state were the State Coordinators for the Regional Curriculum project. The modus operandi for each interviewer was structured by the interview schedule and the procedure of tape recording each interview. Each respondent was asked to complete the structured questions and to respond for taping to the open-ended questions.

Working papers were prepared for each state following the completion of the interviews, and a regional working paper was also prepared. The purpose of these documents was to present the information evolving from the study to the departments as soon as possible so they might use it in their individual efforts to improve their work in the local districts.

Reports of the results, state-by-state, have also been prepared. These reports present the state results of the consultant role study and make generalizations and suggestions based on these data.

The purpose of this document is to present a report of the consultant role study from a regional point-of-view. While there is no such thing as a regional consultant, and this report is certainly no attempt to suggest that there should be, it should be helpful to look at the state department of education consultant as he views his role and as his director views the consultant role.

The report is presented in three sections: the responses to the structured instrument by (1) instructional consultants and (2) vocational consultants and by (3) the responses to the open-ended questions. While there was a great deal of agreement among the responses to the open-ended questions, the responses to the structured items varied such a great deal from the instructional division to the vocational division, it was necessary to separate those responses in order to have meaningful state and regional data.

Following the presentation of the consultants' responses to the structured questions, comparisons are made between consultant perceptions and director perceptions.

The responses to the structured questions are, with one exception, presented on the basis of means.

It will be necessary to give some explanation of the manner in which the data has been organized to assure that the generalizations made are meaningful. The responses of the CIC's to each of the items have been organized according to states and a regional mean has been given to the individual responses of all the states. The regional mean is not an average of the state means but rather a figure arrived at from an analysis of all the responses for the region, disregarding individual states. It should be noted that the mean figure for each item may or may not realistically represent the disposition of consultant responses to that item.

It is important that this be borne in mind so that the generalizations regarding mean figures may be properly understood. While a state by state and item by item analysis of individual responses would be so complex as to be meaningless, an analysis of mean figures cannot be exact. It can, however, be generally true in organizing such things as the relative order in which requests come to most consultants in the region and in the state. It enables us to present a general picture and to observe and point out large trends. The point is that, while there may be exceptions to each of the items, the mean figures will enable us to make, with considerable accuracy, such observations.

It is apparent that mean figures ranging from 4.01-5 represent the situation of a majority of consultants responding in the "frequently" area. Mean figures from 3.01-4 are not quite so reliable; they may represent a majority of consultants responding in the "often" category, or, as in the case cited above, they may represent large concentrations of consultants responding in frequently and sometimes, or a wide distribution of responses. The term "often", then, will be used advisedly; it should not be literally interpreted always to indicate that area of "frequently," but sometimes to determine the range of responses. The mean 2.01-3 is a fairly reliable indicator that the majority of consultants are concentrated in the middle ("sometimes") category, or that they are distributed among the last three categories (never, rarely, sometimes). The mean figure 1.01-2 indicates a concentration of responses in the "rarely" category, in the "never" category, or in both. It must be borne in mind that mean figures are general, but not exact, indicators of the consultants' responses.

STRUCTURED QUESTIONS

Sources of Requests

With Whom the Consultant Works

Methods of Contact

Follow-Up Procedures

Personal Evaluation

Departmental Evaluation

Schedule Development

Frequency of Consultant Activities

Evaluation of Consultant Activities

Responses:

Instructional Division

It is apparent that, in the region, most instructional consultants receive frequent requests for services from supervisors. Instructional consultants often receive requests for services from superintendents, principals, central office personnel, state department colleagues, and professional organizations. Requests for services from colleges and universities, teachers, lay groups, and for regulatory visits are also sometimes received by instructional consultants, and they rarely receive requests for services from school boards. These generalizations are basically true, but a closer analysis of the responses of the consultants in the states to each of the sources will point up some exceptions.

Supervisors. The consultants of all but one of the states frequently receive requests for services from supervisors. The consultants in the "maverick" state (5) receive requests from supervisors often, but there are five other parties from whom these CIC's* receive requests for services more frequently.

The most frequent requests for the instructional supervisor's services in three states come from supervisors, in two states the most frequent requests come from principals, and in one state they come from superintendents. Supervisors are the only group who, in a majority of states, call on the instructional consultant frequently.

Superintendents. The regional mean (3.83) shows that most of the instructional consultants in the Southeastern states often receive requests for services from superintendents. An examination of the means for each of these states will point out a number of exceptions. While in three states the instructional consultants often receive requests for services from superintendents, in two states the

* Note: Consultants from the division of the departments concerned with traditional subject areas are referred to as instructional consultants, or sometimes CIC's because "Curriculum" or "Instruction" is usually a part of the division title. Similarly, vocational division consultants are sometimes cited as VIC's.

SOURCES OF REQUESTS

Curriculum and Instruction — State Comparisons — Mean Ratings

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Supervisors	4.24	4.28	4.59	4.58	4.15	3.35	4.30
Superintendents	3.83	3.94	2.91	3.681	4.55	3.65	4.25
Principals	3.69	4.33	3.14	3.84	3.50	4.41	3.10
Central Office Personnel	3.60	3.17	4.00	3.68	3.45	3.47	3.75
S. D. Colleagues	3.50	3.44	3.54	3.21	3.60	3.47	3.75
Professional Organizations	3.27	3.28	3.05	3.79	2.90	3.47	3.20
Colleges and Universities	3.05	3.00	2.95	3.68	2.75	2.94	3.00
Teachers	2.92	3.22	2.73	3.21	2.60	3.12	2.70
Lay Groups	2.50	2.39	2.36	3.95	2.15	3.00	2.30
Regulatory	2.32	1.44	1.91	2.47	2.75	2.82	2.55
School Boards	1.57	1.39	1.64	1.63	1.35	1.82	1.60

instructional consultants frequently receive such requests and in one state (2) the CIC's receive them sometimes. While superintendents are ranked second (based on mean figures) in two of the states, in the remainder they rank respectively first, third, fourth, and seventh. In other words, in all but one of the six states, the services of most of the instructional consultants are regularly drafted by the superintendent.

Principals. The regional mean figure for the frequency of requests from principals (3.69) indicates that these educators often call on the instructional consultant for aid and that principals are ranked third in the region.

While there is some diversity among states, in all of them most of the instructional consultants are called upon for aid regularly by principals.

In all but one of the states, there is only one source (supervisors) from which most of the instructional consultants frequently receive requests for services. In five of the six states, supervisors make these request frequently. In two states superintendents make frequent requests for services. Supervisors are the only educators who frequently request the consultant's services in a majority of the states. Superintendents and principals make requests for the consultants' services regularly in all the states.

Central Office Personnel. In all of the states, central office personnel ask for the instructional consultant's help often. There are no states in which the instructional consultant frequently receive requests from central office personnel, but also there are no states in which instructional consultant's receive these requests less than often. Although central office personnel do not rank fourth in all the states, they are, both in the region and in each of the states, not an uncommon source of requests for services.

State Department Colleagues. State department colleagues often request the services of the instructional supervisors in all of the six states of the region. Instructional consultants receive requests for services from their colleagues regularly in all states. State department colleagues are among the five sources who most frequently request the consultant's aid.

Professional Organizations. Professional organizations often request the aid of the instructional consultant in all but one state. In the remaining state, these organizations sometimes call on the consultant for aid. Most instructional consultants receive requests for services from professional organizations with moderate regularity.

Teachers. The states are evenly divided with respect to the frequency of requests for services from teachers. In three of the states the instructional consultants are called upon sometimes and in three states, often. It is accurate to say then, that in all states, despite some slight differences, requests for services from teachers come only occasionally.

Colleges and Universities. In one state (mean 3.68) the instructional consultant receives such requests often. With this one exception, it may be said that requests for services from colleges and universities come to consultants only sometimes.

Lay Groups. The instructional consultant in all of the six states receive requests for services from lay groups sometimes. The regional mean 2.50 accurately reflects this situation.

Regulatory. The regional mean of 2.32 indicates that such requests are made only on occasion. While the CIC's in four states sometimes are called upon to make regulatory visits, those in the two remaining states rarely receive such requests.

School Boards. The mean figure for the region (1.57) accurately reflects the disposition of the states here, all of the states rarely receive requests for services from school boards.

In summary, while there are exceptions, it is generally true that in the southeastern region requests for services come most frequently from supervisors. Next are requests from superintendents and principals, who, in two states, frequently request instructional consultant's help.

There are three sources which often make requests. These are central office personnel, state department colleagues, and professional organizations.

Three others make requests occasionally. These include colleges and universities, teachers, and lay groups.

Two sources, regulatory and school boards, seldom make requests for services.

Regional Comparison of Directors' and Consultants' Conceptions

Frequency of Sources of Request

Source	FREQUENCY MEANS		
	Directors (N = 7)	Consultants (N = 116)	Diff. Above .50
Supervisors	4.29	4.24	
Principals	3.86	3.69	
Central Office Personnel	3.86	3.60	
Superintendents	3.57	3.83	
Professional Organizations	3.29	3.27	
S. D. Colleagues	3.14	3.50	
Teachers	2.71	2.92	
Colleges and Universities	2.57	3.05	
Lay Groups	2.43	2.50	
Regulatory	2.29	2.32	
School Boards	2.29	1.57	.72

The directors under whose supervision these instructional consultants work were asked to give their conceptions of the ways in which consultants in their divisions work. It should be observed from the table above that in no case do the frequency means indicating the directors' conceptions differ greatly from those indicating the consultants' conceptions of the frequency of the requests for his service. There is only one case in which the difference between the mean figures exceeds .50. Directors judge that the consultants receive requests from school boards sometimes (2.29), at the same rate of frequency as they receive requests for regulatory visits, while the consultants indicated that they rarely receive requests for services from school boards. Such evidence would indicate that the directors are generally aware of the relative frequencies with which consultants receive requests for services from the sources listed.

With Whom Does the Consultant Work?

Consultants work with a number of individuals and groups at varying frequencies. The table below lists the frequency means compiled from both instructional consultants state and regional responses to these items.

WORK WITH

Curriculum and Instruction — State Comparisons — Mean Ratings

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Groups of Teachers	4.26	4.61	3.82	4.68	4.29	4.12	4.20
S. D. Colleagues	4.09	4.06	4.05	3.95	4.20	4.18	4.10
Individual Supervisors	3.90	3.94	4.41	3.89	3.55	3.29	4.20
Professional Organizations	3.48	3.55	3.79	3.20	3.20	3.47	3.30
Individual Superintendents	3.45	3.78	2.91	3.00	3.85	3.29	3.95
Individual School Principals	3.42	3.83	3.09	3.16	3.75	3.53	3.35
Groups of Supervisors	3.38	3.17	4.00	3.58	2.85	3.11	3.50
Groups of Principals	3.25	3.17	3.73	3.21	2.95	3.18	3.20
Individual Central Office	3.10	2.89	3.77	2.89	2.65	2.94	3.50
Individual Teachers	3.08	3.28	2.59	3.47	3.05	3.35	2.90
Groups from Colleges	3.00	3.11	2.91	3.63	2.65	2.94	2.95
Groups of Central Office	2.84	2.61	3.68	2.89	2.35	2.59	2.75
Lay Groups	2.55	2.50	2.59	3.11	2.15	2.71	2.25
Groups of Superintendents	2.35	2.50	2.18	2.47	2.05	2.29	2.60
School Boards	1.59	1.33	1.59	1.58	1.50	1.71	1.75

There are two classes of people with whom the instructional consultant in a majority of the states works frequently. In all but one state (2) the instructional consultants work frequently with groups of teachers and frequently with state department colleagues. In the two exceptional states, the consultants work quite often (means 3.82 and 3.95) respectively with groups of teachers and with state department colleagues.

There are seven classes of educators with whom the instructional consultant in a majority of states work often. These include individual supervisors, professional organizations, individual superintendents, individual school principals, groups of supervisors, groups of principals and individual teachers.

In four states, the instructional consultant works often with supervisors, in two, frequently. The consultant works often with professional organizations in all states, with the rank by means ranging from fourth to eighth within the states. In four of the six states, instructional consultants work often with superintendents, sometimes in the remaining two states. While most of the consultants have regular working contacts with superintendents, the frequency rank ranges from third to eleventh.

In all states the instructional consultant works regularly with individual principals. The consultants often work with groups of supervisors and groups of principals in five of the six states. In four of the six states, they also work fairly often with individual teachers and only sometimes in the other two states.

There are five classes of people with whom most consultants only sometimes work. The instructional consultant occasionally works with individual central office personnel, groups from colleges, groups of central office personnel, lay groups, and groups of superintendents.

While the instructional consultant in two states often work with individual central office personnel (means 3.50 and 3.77), the consultants in the four remaining states only work with these individuals sometimes. A majority of the state means shows that the instructional consultant works with these individuals only on occasion (means ranging from 2.65 to 2.94).

Such is the case with groups from colleges. The means would indicate that, while there is some diversity from state to state and within the states themselves, most instructional consultants only occasionally work with groups from colleges.

With slightly less regularity the instructional consultant in the region works with groups of central office personnel (mean 2.84). It is clear that the majority of instructional consultants do not work with groups of central office personnel on a regular basis.

Neither does the majority of instructional consultants work with lay groups. There is really little significant diversity; most instructional consultants only work sometimes with lay groups.

There are no exceptions in the case of groups of superintendents. The instructional consultant in the region works sometimes with groups of superintendents (mean 2.35).

There are also no exceptions concerning school boards — the instructional consultants in all six states rarely work with these organizations.

Summary

There are several observations which may be made concerning the frequency with which consultants in this region work with the individuals and groups listed above. The instructional consultant in all states work quite regularly with groups of teachers, but not very regularly with individual teachers. In most other cases, the instructional consultants work more frequently with educators individually than with the same educators in groups. Consultants work more frequently with individual state department colleagues, supervisors, superintendents, principals, and central office personnel than with groups of these. The five working contacts with whom consultants have the least frequent connections are groups, including groups from colleges, groups of central office personnel, lay groups, groups of superintendents, and school boards. There are two exceptions to this generalization; in two states the mean figures would indicate that consultants work more frequently with groups of principals than with individual principals. In one state consultants work with groups of central office personnel with the same frequency with which they work with the individuals (means 2.89).

Despite these exceptions, there is a clearly observable trend through the region and within the states for consultants to work with individuals more frequently than with groups.

COMPARISON OF CONSULTANTS' AND DIRECTORS' CONCEPTIONS OF FREQUENCY OF WORK WITH

Source	Directors' Frequency (N = 7)	Consultants' Frequency (N = 7)	Diff.
State Dept. Colleagues	4.14	4.09	
Groups of Teachers	4.00	4.26	
Groups of Supervisors	4.00	3.38	.62
Individual Supervisors	3.71	3.90	
Groups of Principals	3.57	3.25	
Individual Superintendents	3.29	3.45	
Groups of Superintendents	3.29	2.35	1.04
Professional Organizations	3.29	3.48	
Individual Central Office	3.00	3.10	
Groups of Central Office	3.00	2.84	
Individual School Principals	2.86	3.42	.56
Groups from Colleges	2.86	3.00	
Lay Groups	2.43	2.55	
Individual Teachers	2.29	3.05	.79
School Boards	1.71	1.59	

A comparison of the mean figures of directors' and consultants' conceptions of frequency shows that in several instances the directors' picture of the consultants' role does not correspond with the consultants' picture.

The table above should show that in many cases the directors agree with their consultants. There are, however, two major differences between their conceptions; one, a general difference, the other, a matter of several particular variances. The figures for directors show that the directors felt that consultants work more frequently with groups than with individuals. The figures for consultants show that, contrary to the directors' conception, they work more frequently with individuals than with groups.

There are also several particular differences. Consultants and directors do not agree on the frequency with which consultants work with groups of teachers, groups of supervisors, groups of superintendents, individual school principals, and individual teachers. The difference between means assigned to each of these ranges from .56 to 1.04; only in two cases are the differences in rank greater than five places.

The most meaningful observation to be made here is that, whether intentionally or not, directors indicate that they think their consultants work with groups as frequently or more frequently than with individuals. The actual experience of the consultant does not bear this conception out; with the one exception of groups of teachers, consultants indicate that they work more frequently with individuals. The fact that the disagreement occurs in five instances corroborates the generalization that directors may not have a full understanding of the frequency with which consultants work with different groups and individuals.

Methods of Contact

Most commonly consultants contact those with whom they work by paying personal visits. Visiting is the means of communicating most frequently employed in the region and in each of the six states.

METHODS OF CONTACT

Curriculum and Instruction – State Comparisons – Means Ratings

	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6
Personal Visit	4.64	4.61	4.50	4.95	4.75	4.65	4.40
Letters, Newsletters	4.06	3.72	4.18	4.63	4.10	4.06	3.65
Telephone	4.03	3.83	3.73	4.63	3.80	4.17	4.10
Team	3.43	3.61	3.32	3.37	3.25	3.65	3.40
ETC	1.99	2.33	1.45	2.26	2.05	2.18	1.80

The instructional consultants in the states do not agree unanimously on the frequency with which they send letters to the people with whom they work. Two states send letters and newsletters often, four states send them frequently. However; throughout the region and within each of the states, instructional consultants quite regularly establish contact by sending letters and newsletters.

With almost the same frequency, consultants use the telephone. Consultants in three states often telephone, in the remaining states, frequently.

Consultants often make team visits. The regional mean of 3.43 is an accurate reflection of the means of each of the states.

Consultants do not regularly make use of ETV to communicate with local schools. While the instructional consultants in four states do so sometimes, in the two other states, they rarely do so.

Comparison of Directors' and Consultants' Conception of Frequency

A comparison of the directors' with the consultants' conceptions shows little meaningful difference. The mean figures for the two responses are listed below along with the difference between the two mean figures.

<u>Methods of Contact</u>	(N = 116) <u>Consultants' Mean</u>	(N = 7) <u>Directors' Mean</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Personal Visit	4.64	4.14	.50
Letters, Newsletters	4.06	3.71	.35
Telephone	4.03	3.86	.17
Team	3.43	2.86	.57
ETV	1.99	2.29	.30

The directors' mean is slightly higher than the consultants' for the telephone than for letters and newsletters, and the directors' mean is not so high for personal visits as is the consultants' mean. The differences between means is as great as .50 only in two cases, which would indicate that consultants make slightly more personal visits and more team visits than the directors realize and that consultants make use of ETV with slightly less regularity than their directors conceive.

Follow-up Procedures

The following table gives the ways in which consultants follow up their contacts.

FOLLOW UP PROCEDURE

Curriculum and Instruction — State Comparisons — Means Ratings

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Letters	4.06	4.06	4.09	3.95	4.65	4.29	3.35
Informational Material	3.90	4.06	3.73	4.37	4.15	3.88	3.25
Subsequent Visit	3.75	3.94	3.50	4.11	3.25	3.65	4.10
Telephone	3.64	3.50	3.41	4.21	3.50	3.59	3.65
Series of Subsequent Visits	3.28	3.61	3.32	3.89	2.65	2.82	3.35
S. D. Referral	3.19	3.22	3.18	3.16	2.85	3.59	3.20

Throughout the region the instructional consultant follow-up procedures are, in order of frequency, letters, informational material, subsequent visits, telephone, series of subsequent visits, and state department referrals.

It would appear that throughout the region, the follow-up procedure most frequently employed by consultants is the writing of letters.

Informational material is dispatched frequently by the instructional consultants in three states and often in three other states. Through out the region consultants regularly send informational material to local schools.

Consultants also regularly make subsequent visits and commonly use the telephone to follow up their contacts with local schools. The instructional consultants in all the states use the telephone, but not with the regularity which they reserve for letters, informational material, and subsequent visits.

The consultants in most of the states also commonly follow up a contact with a local school by paying a series of subsequent visits. In most cases, consultants more frequently make a single subsequent visit than a series of subsequent visits. But, throughout the region, instructional consultants at least occasionally follow up by making a series of subsequent visits.

Consultants also follow up their contacts with the local schools by making state department referrals. In five states the consultants make referrals often. In the remaining state, consultants make referrals on occasion. The CIC's in the region follow up with state department referrals on a fairly common basis.

A comparison of the mean difference between consultants' and directors' perceptions of frequency of follow-up procedures confirms earlier evidence that the directors are not in all cases aware of the extent of the role of the CIC. While consultants most frequently follow-up by sending letters, directors do not seem to be aware of the frequency of this activity. Directors also appear to be unaware of the frequency with which consultants follow-up by telephoning. Directors' and consultants' perceptions of follow-up frequency in other cases seem to be generally in agreement.

Comparison of Directors' and Consultants' Conceptions
Follow-up Procedures

Follow-Up Procedure	Directors (N = 7)	Consultants (N = 116)	Difference
Letters	3.00	4.06	1.06*
Informational Material	3.57	3.90	.33
Subsequent Visit	3.77	3.75	.02
Telephone	3.14	3.64	.50*
Series of Subsequent Visits	3.00	3.28	.28
S. D. Referrals	3.14	3.19	.05

Personal Evaluation Practices.

Consultants were asked to indicate the extend of their personal evaluation practices by responding within the range from "none" to "extensive." These responses are tabulated below.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
None	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Limited	14%	5	23	11	15	12	15
Moderate	45%	39	45	26	55	53	55
Extensive	41%	56	32	63	30	35	30

The most obvious finding is that all consultants are to some extent engaged in personal evaluation (not one consultant responded with "none"). Within the region the extent of this personal evaluation ranges from limited to extensive, with the concentration of responses being moderate and extensive. A small percentage of consultants (14%) who engage in evaluation do so on a limited basis. The extent of personal evaluation generally may be characterized as moderate to extensive, with a slightly greater number of consultants responding in the moderate range than in the other ranges.

Departmental Evaluation

The Consultants were also asked to give their judgment of the extent of department efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of their services. The following table gives their responses.

Evaluation Practices – Instructional Division (N = 116)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
None	8%	0%	18%	0%	10%	12%	5%
Limited	43%	28%	36%	26%	55%	53%	55%
Moderate	36%	39%	36%	47%	25%	29%	40%
Extensive	13%	33%	9%	26%	10%	6%	0%

Departmental evaluation of the consultant's effectiveness is not as widespread as the consultant's self-evaluation. In four of the six states of the region, there are a few consultants (5 to 18%) who indicate that there are no departmental evaluations of their services.

Throughout the region, and within most of the states, departmental evaluation of the consultants' services is either limited or moderate. While there are a number of consultants who report that they engage in extensive self-evaluation, in all states the general rule is that state departments do not make extensive efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of their consultants' services.

Schedule Development

Consultants were asked to report the manner in which they developed their schedules. The following table gives their responses to this section of the survey.

Schedule Development - Instructional Division - (N = 116)							
Manner of Development	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6
Personal Development	69%	72%	32%	100%	70%	65%	80%
Personal and Submit for Approval	24	28	68	0	20	12	10
Developed for You	1	0	0	0	0	6	0
Other	6	0	0	0	10	18	10

Throughout the region the majority of consultants (69%) develop their schedules independently, a minority (24%) develop them and submit them to a supervisor for approval, and a very small minority respectively have their schedules developed for them (1%) or employ some other undetermined means (6%). Within all but one of the states the case is the same: the majority of consultants develop their schedules personally and independently, without any supervision.

Despite a few exceptions it is true that most of the instructional consultants in the region exercise personal independence in the area of schedule development and are not required to obtain the approval of supervisors.

Frequency of Consultant Activities

An examination of the relative frequency with which consultants perform job activities provides further information concerning their roles. Below is a list of the activities in which consultants participate as they work or prepare to work with the local schools.

The most common of the instructional consultant's activities involves participation in workshops. Of the 116 consultants in the region, 58 (one-half) frequently participate in these activities, and 48 do so often. In one state the most common activity involves visiting and observing in the classroom, while the second most common activity is participating in workshops. With this one exception, most of the consultants in the region most frequently participate in workshop activities.

Consultants assist in the planning of workshops almost as frequently as they take part in workshop activities throughout the region. Forty-four CIC's, a plurality of the 116 interviewed, frequently assist with workshop planning, and thirty-nine others do so often. Throughout the region and within each of the states most consultants signified either that they often or frequently assist in the planning of workshop activities.

Consultants regularly assist in evaluation other than accreditation and standards. The regional total of responses shows that more than half of the consultants in the region quite regularly assist in evaluation other than accreditation and standards.

Consultants also regularly participate in the activities of professional organizations. Regionally this activity merits almost precisely as frequent participation from instructional consultants as does other evaluation. In all but one state, the majority of consultants either frequently or often participate in the activities of professional organizations.

Providing the names of outside resource people is another of the instructional consultant's common activities. Throughout the region and within each of the states most consultants regularly provide the names of outside resource people.

Another of the consultant's common activities involves assisting in the development of curriculum guides. Of the 116 instructional con

ACTIVITIES – FREQUENCY

Curriculum and Instruction – State Comparisons – Means Rating

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Participate in Workshops Activities	4.37	4.56	4.27	4.63	4.00	4.41	4.35
Assist in Planning of Workshop Activities	3.95	4.22	3.73	4.37	3.55	4.06	3.85
Assist in Eval. other than Accred. & Standards	3.90	4.11	4.05	4.00	3.60	4.06	3.60
Participate in Activities of Professional Organ.	3.86	3.78	4.09	4.21	3.50	4.06	3.55
Provide Names of Outside Resource People	3.81	3.67	3.82	4.21	3.55	3.94	3.70
Assist in the Development of Curriculum Guides	3.66	3.72	3.77	4.21	4.50	3.65	3.10
Visit and Observe in the Classroom	3.63	3.72	3.27	3.79	4.15	3.53	3.25
Collect and Disseminate Current Curr. Inform.	3.59	3.89	3.59	3.89	3.40	3.41	3.35
Assist in Accred. & Standards Program	3.58	3.39	3.59	4.00	3.95	3.29	3.15
Assist in Development of Programs for Federal Funding	3.45	3.17	3.77	3.16	3.10	3.58	3.85
Write and Distribute Bulletins for Curr. Mat.	3.43	3.72	3.50	3.68	3.55	3.29	2.80
Prepare Bibliographical Listing	3.28	3.94	3.00	3.74	3.20	3.06	2.80
Participate in Orientation Programs for New Personnel	3.04	3.06	3.55	2.74	2.80	3.29	2.80
Arrange Inter-System Visitation	2.71	2.72	2.59	2.95	2.45	2.76	2.85
Work with Citizens or Lay Groups	2.70	2.67	2.59	3.16	2.30	3.18	2.45
Assist Textbook Selection Committee	2.53	1.94	2.90	2.37	2.70	3.12	2.05
Teach Demonstration Lessons	2.38	2.22	2.23	3.11	2.10	2.58	2.15

sultants interviewed in the region, forty-three indicated that they often assist in the development of curriculum guides, thirty-eight indicated that they do so on occasion, and twenty-four indicated that they do so frequently. Although there is some diversity among the states, most consultants are regularly involved in developing curriculum guides.

Regionally, visiting and observing in the classroom is an activity in which one-half of the consultants participate either frequently or often. With the exception of one state in which most consultants frequently visit and observe in the classroom, most of the consultants often, or at least sometimes, do so.

There is some diversity in the frequency with which consultants collect and disseminate current curriculum information. The regional total of responses shows that the majority of consultants is split between the ratings of "often" and "sometimes." From state to state there is considerable diversity with most consultants in three states often collecting and disseminating current curriculum information and most of the consultants in three other states doing so on occasion. For all consultants it is not an uncommon activity.

With slightly greater frequency, consultants assist in accreditation and standards programs. Regionally most consultants (over 50%) either do so frequently or often. Most of the remainder at least occasionally assist in accreditation and standards programs, although there are thirteen who never do and eight who do so rarely. While not as common as assisting in other evaluation, assisting in accreditation and standards programs is a fairly regular activity for many consultants.

There is again some diversity in the frequency with which consultants assist in the development of programs for federal funding. A plurality (39) do so on occasion; a similar number (35) do so often; and a lesser number (22) do so frequently. For all but twenty of the instructional consultants in the region, assisting in the development of programs for federal funding is at least an occasional, at most a frequent, activity.

Such is the case for all but twenty-seven instructional consultants with regard to the frequency of writing and distributing bulletins and curriculum material. While twenty-three per cent never or rarely write and distribute bulletins and curriculum materials, thirty-three

per cent (the plurality) do so on occasion, seventeen per cent do so often, and twenty-seven per cent do so frequently. There is considerable diversity of frequency in each state and in the region; more than half of the consultants, however, write and distribute bulletins and curriculum materials either never, rarely, sometimes. This is generally a less frequent activity for consultants than assisting in the development of curriculum guides or collecting and disseminating current curriculum information.

There is no one rate of frequency at which most instructional consultants prepare bibliographical listings. While forty per cent of the CIC's in the region either do so often or frequently, sixty per cent do so on occasion, rarely, or never. Within the state there is also considerable diversity. In one state nearly all consultants either rarely or occasionally prepare bibliographical listing; in one state nearly all consultants do so often or frequently; and in the four remaining states the rates vary with a plurality of consultants sometimes preparing bibliographical listings. This is an activity to which the CIC's devote varying attention; over seventy-two per cent, however, prepare bibliographical listings occasionally, often, or frequently.

Consultants also participate in the orientation of new personnel at varying frequencies. In three states a plurality of consultants sometimes participate in the orientation of new personnel; in the other three states there is no single frequency at which a large number of respondents is concentrated. Most consultants do not frequently participate in orientation programs for new personnel, but they do so at least occasionally.

With slightly less regularity consultants arrange intersystem visitations. Almost one half of the consultants in the region (fifty-one of 116) make these arrangements sometimes, but nearly all of the remainder (46) rarely or never do so. Arranging inter-system visitation is not a common activity for most consultants.

Work with citizens or lay groups is also an uncommon activity for most consultants. Regionally the totals show that a large number of consultants (48) work with these groups on occasion and that most of the remaining consultants (47 of 68) rarely or never do. There is little diversity among the states. While consultants work with citizens and lay groups occasionally, they do not work with them on a regular basis.

Most consultants seldom assist textbook selection committees. Assisting textbook selection committees is one of the least common of all the activities in which consultants participate.

Regionally, the least common of all of the instructional consultants' activities is teaching demonstration lessons. In all of the states, either teaching demonstration lessons or assisting textbook selection committees is the least frequent activity. A substantial number of the CIC's interviewed never teach demonstration lessons; most of the remainder do so rarely or only sometimes.

Summary

The most frequent of all of the instructional consultant's activities involves participation in workshops. Eighty-nine per cent of the consultants either frequently or often participate in this activity, and in all but one of the states participation in workshops is the most frequent activity. (In the "maverick" state, 4, visiting and observing in the classroom is the most common activity while participating in workshop activities is the second most common.) There are four other activities in which a large majority of consultants either frequently or often participate. These include assisting in the planning of workshop activities, assisting in evaluation other than accreditation and standards, participating in the activities of professional organizations, and providing the names of outside resource people.

There are several other activities in which a majority of the consultants participate often or frequently; however, for each of these activities the largest numbers of consultants usually either participate often and sometimes, or sometimes and frequently, rather than at the two highest rates. These activities include assisting in the development of curriculum guides, visiting and observing in the classroom, collecting and disseminating current curriculum information, and assisting in accreditation and standards. Consultants take part in these undertakings at varying rates, but most of them participate in them at least sometimes, and many do so quite regularly.

The eight remaining activities are distinguished from those mentioned above by the fact that less than fifty percent of the instructional consultant's in the region participate in them at the two highest rates, "often" and "frequently." While the frequency with which consultants perform these activities varies, for four of them

the concentration of responses is in the "sometimes" category, and most of the remainder of the responses in the two higher categories. These activities include assisting in the development of programs for federal funding, writing and distributing bulletins and curriculum materials, preparing bibliographical listing, and participating in the orientation of new personnel. Although some consultants seldom take part in these activities, most consultants participate in them at least occasionally.

The four remaining activities are not frequently common activities for most instructional consultants in the region. Almost fifty per cent of the consultants in the region sometimes arrange inter-system visitation and work with citizens and lay groups, but most of the remainder never or rarely participate in these activities. Over fifty percent of the consultants in the region rarely or never assist textbook selection committees and teach demonstration lessons, while most of the remainder do so only on occasion.

Workshop activities and the planning of these activities are the most common of the instructional consultant's undertakings. The consultant's also quite regularly take part in the activities of professional organizations. They assist in evaluation other than accreditation and standards more commonly than they assist in accreditation and standards programs. They also assist in the development of curriculum guides more commonly than they collect and disseminate current curriculum information or write and distribute bulletins and curriculum materials. Most of the instructional consultants rarely assist textbook selection committees or teach demonstration lessons. Their activities seem frequently to bring them into contact with groups, probably in a workshop setting, and not often to bring them into contact with the classroom.

Comparison of Directors' and Consultant's Perceptions of Frequency of Activities.

The directors under whose supervision the CIC's work were asked to give their perceptions of the frequency of consultant activities. The following table presents the individual responses of the directors, the mean figure based on these, and the mean figure representing the consultants' frequency perception.

Activity	Director's Responses					Dir. Mean (N=7)	Cons. Mean (N=116)
	1	2	3	4	5		
* Assist in Accreditation and Standards Programs	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	3.58
Participate in Workshops	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	4.37
Assist in the Development of Programs for Fed. Funding	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	3.45
Assist in the Planning of Workshops	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	3.95
* Assist in Evaluation Other Than Accred. & Stand.	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	3.90
Write and Distribute Bulletins and Curriculum Materials	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	3.43
Collect and Disseminate Current Curriculum Information	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	3.59
Assist in the Development of Curriculum Guides	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	3.66
Prepare Bibliographical Listing	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	3.28
Provide Names of Outside Resource People	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	3.81
* Participate in the Activities of Professional Organ.	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	3.86
Visit and Observe in the Classroom	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	3.63
Assist Textbook Selection Committees	1	1	4	0	1	2.86	2.53
Work with Citizens or Lay Group	0	1	6	0	0	2.86	2.70
Participate in the Orientation of New Personnel	0	3	3	1	0	2.71	3.04
Arrange Inter-system Visitation	1	2	4	0	0	2.43	2.71
Teach Demonstration Lessons	1	5	1	0	0	2.00	2.38

In a number of instances the directors' perceptions of frequency are similar to those of the consultants'. There are, however, several cases where they differ greatly. The activities concerning which consultants and directors differ most dramatically include assisting in accreditation and standards programs, assisting in other evaluation, participating in the activities of professional organizations, and participating in workshop activities. According to a majority of the directors (4 of 7), the instructional consultant frequently assists in accreditation and standards programs. Only thirty-two of the 116 consultants interviewed responded that they frequently assist with this type of evaluation; most of the remainder do so either often or on occasion.

It is interesting to note that most of the directors think that consultants frequently assist in accreditation and standards programs and often assist in other evaluation, which according to the consultants' responses, most do not frequently assist in accreditation and standards programs.

There is only one activity in which a majority (58 of 116) of the instructional consultants participate frequently, workshop activities. Most of the directors think that consultants often participate in workshop activities, while only two indicated that consultants do so frequently.

The directors do not seem to be aware of the frequency consultant's work with professional organizations. While consultants indicate frequent or often participation, a plurality of directors (3 of 7) think that consultants sometimes participate in the activities of professional organizations; two directors think they do so often; and one director thinks they do so frequently. It is apparent that in this case the directors' perception again differs from that of the consultant.

The directors' estimate of the frequency of the instructional consultant other activities seems to be compatible with the perception of the consultant. In view of the fact that the directors do not seem to be aware of the frequency of several of the consultants' most common activities, it may be the possibility exists that the directors' perception of the consultants' role is not an entirely clear one.

Evaluation of Consultant Activities

The consultants were asked to evaluate the seventeen activities to which they had assigned frequency ratings. The consultants were asked to read over the list of activities and then to check the five which they considered most effective. The following table gives the results of this question. The figures represent the percentage of consultants who considered each activity effective.

ACTIVITIES - EVALUATION

Curriculum and Instruction - State Comparisons - Selection Percentage*

	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6
Participate in Workshop Activity	63%	61%	59%	79%	60%	59%	60%
Assist in Planning of Workshop Activities	50	55	55	53	35	41	60
Assist in the Development of Curr. Guides	44	50	23	58	70	35	35
Visit and Observe in the Classroom	43	50	18	68	30	59	35
Assist in Eval. other than Accred. & Stand.	42	44	32	37	40	59	45
Collect & Disseminate Current Curr. Inform.	32	39	50	32	20	12	40
Assist in Development of Programs for Federal Fund.	30	11	32	16	15	59	50
Assist in Accred. & Stand Program	30	39	45	5	50	29	15
Participate in Activities of Prof. Organ.	26	5	59	26	20	18	20
Write & Distribute Bulletins Curr. Mat.	25	39	27	21	35	18	10
Teach Demonstration Lessons	20	17	9	42	20	6	25
Arrange Inter-System Visitation	16	22	5	5	10	18	35
Participate in Orientation Programs for New Personnel	13	28	5	5	15	0	30
Provide Names of Outside Resource People	6	5	5	0	5	6	15
Work with Citizens or Lay Groups	5	0	0	5	15	12	0
Assist Textbook Selection Committee	3	0	9	0	0	6	0
Prepare Bibliographical Listing	3	11	5	0	5	0	0

*Selections were limited to five choices by each individual

There was no activity which at least a few consultants in the region did not consider to be effective. There was considerable difference in the evaluations of consultants from state to state. Using the regional totals, however, five activities can be isolated as those considered by most consultants to be more effective than the other activities. These five are (1) participating in workshop activities, (2) assisting in the planning of workshop activities, (3) assisting in the development of curriculum guides, (4) visiting and observing in the classroom, and (5) assisting in evaluation other than accreditation and standards.

Participating in Workshop Activities. More consultants in the region (63%) consider workshop activities as effective than they do any other activity. In all states, a majority of the instructional consultants chose participation in workshops as one of their five most effective activities.

Assisting in the Planning of Workshop Activities. Almost as important as participation in workshops is the planning of workshops. One-half of the instructional consultants in the region consider workshop planning an effective activity. At least fifty per cent of the consultants in four of the states indicate that they feel that this activity is effective. In all of the states, assisting in the planning of workshop activities is considered to be one of the consultant's most effective activities.

Assisting in the Development of Curriculum Guides. Another activity which is considered effective by nearly one-half of the instructional consultants in the region (44%) concerns curriculum guides. A large number of consultants in three states value this activity. In one state (4) seventy per cent of the instructional consultants value this activity; in two other states majorities of fifty and fifty-eight per cent feel that assisting in the development of curriculum guides is an effective activity. In one state more consultants consider assisting in the development of curriculum guides a more effective activity than they do any other, and in the remaining states substantial numbers of consultants find this activity professionally rewarding.

Visiting and Observing in the Classroom. Regionally, only one per cent fewer consultants value visiting and observing in the classroom than those who value assisting in the development of curriculum guides. While there again some diversity among the states in the relative numbers of consultants who regard this as an effective activity, nearly half of the instructional consultants in the region (43%) find that visiting and observing in the classroom is a productive undertaking.

Assisting in the Evaluation other than Accreditation and Standards. Consultants in each of the states are in greater agreement as to the effectiveness of this activity. Regionally, a relatively large number of consultants (42%) value assisting in other evaluations. Assisting in evaluation other than accreditation and standards is considered by many consultants in five states and most consultants in the sixth state as one of the most effective activities of the instructional consultant.

The remaining twelve activities also received responses indicating them as effective activities. The range of responses to these activities runs for almost one third of respondents for collecting and disseminating current curriculum information to a three per cent response for preparing bibliographical listings. The preceding chart which presents the selection percentages in rank order according to the regional percentage is helpful in taking a closer look at these activities.

Summary

While there are differences from state to state, most consultants are in agreement that their effective activities include participating in workshop activities, assisting in the development of curriculum guides, visiting and observing in the classroom, and assisting in evaluation other than accreditation and standards. Among the activities which few, if any, consultants find to be effective are providing the names of outside resource people, working with citizens or lay groups, assisting textbook selection committees and preparing bibliographical listings.

Comparison of Consultants' and Directors' Evaluation of Activities.

The directors under whose supervision these instructional consultants work were asked to indicate five activities they consider to be the consultants' most effective. The following table gives the percentage of directors who chose each of the activities along with the comparable percentage of consultants.

	Directors' Perceptions (N = 7)	Consultants' Perceptions (N = 116)
Assist in the planning of workshop activities	100	50
Participate in workshop activities	70	63
Assist in the development of curriculum guides	70	44
Assist in Accreditation and Standards programs	42	30
Assist in evaluation other than Accreditation and Standards	42	42
Collect and disseminate current information	42	32
Write and distribute bulletins and curriculum material	29	25
Arrange inter-system visitations	29	16
Assist in development of programs for federal funding	29	30
Visit and observe in the classroom	14	43
Participate in the activities of professional organizations	14	26
Provide names of outside resource people	14	6
Teach demonstration lessons	0	20
Participate in orientation programs for new personnel	0	13
Assist textbook selection committees	0	3
Work with citizens or lay groups	0	5
Prepare bibliographical listing	0	3

For the most part, the directors' evaluations coincide with those of the consultant. Most consultants value planning and participating in workshops, assisting in the development of curriculum guides, assisting in evaluation other than accreditation and standards programs, and visiting and observing in the classroom. Most directors indicated that they consider all but visiting and observing in the classroom to be effective. Unlike the consultants, more directors value assisting in the planning of workshops than participating in workshop activities.

On the other hand, directors placed assisting with accreditation and standards in the top five activities, while it ranked eighth with the consultants. Otherwise, there was substantial agreement between consultant and directors.

Comparison of Frequency and Evaluation of Consultants' Activities

The consultants have indicated both the frequency and the effectiveness of the seventeen activities listed in the structured interview instrument. A comparison of frequency and evaluation of the Instructional consultant's activities may give some indication of how well these consultants spend their time. The following table presents the regional mean figure for frequency and the regional selection percentage for evaluation of the activities.

Comparison of Frequency and Evaluation of Consultants' Activities (N = 116)

	Frequency Mean	Selection Percentage
Participate in Workshop Activities	4.37	63%
Assist in the Planning of Workshop Activities	3.95	50
Assist in Evaluation other than Accreditation and Standards	3.90	42
*Participate in Activities of Professional Organizations	3.86	26
*Provide Names of Outside Resource People	3.81	6
Assist in the Development of Curriculum Guides	3.66	44
Visit and Observe in the Classroom	3.63	43
Collect and Disseminate Current Curriculum Information	3.59	32
Assist in Accreditation and Standards Programs	3.58	30
Assist in the Development of Programs for Federal Funding	3.45	30
Write and Distribute Bulletins and Curriculum Materials	3.43	25
*Prepare Bibliographical Listing	3.28	3
Participate in Orientation of New Personnel	3.04	13
Arrange Inter-System Visitation	2.71	16
Work with Citizens or Lay Groups	2.70	5
Assist Textbook Selection Committees	2.53	20
*Teach Demonstration Lessons	2.38	20

As the table shows, in a number of cases the frequency and the effectiveness of the consultant's activities correspond; for example, participating in and planning workshop activities are the two most frequent of the consultants' undertakings, and they are the two activities found to be most effective by more consultants than any other activity. For all but a few of the activities the frequency and effectiveness assigned to them by consultants are in relative agreement.

There are, however, four activities (marked with asterisks in the table) for which frequency and effectiveness indications do not

agree. These are participating in the activities of professional organizations, providing the names of outside resource people, preparing bibliographical listing, and teaching demonstration lessons.

In only one of the states of the region (2) do a majority of the consultants find that participating in the activities of professional organizations is effective, yet in all of the states a majority of the instructional consultants either often or frequently participate in this activity. Regionally, one of the five activities which consultants take part in most frequently involves providing the names of outside resource people, although no more than six per cent of the consultants in the region regard this as an effective activity. An activity which even fewer consultants (3%) find to be effective is preparing bibliographical listing. While consultants prepare bibliographies at varying rates, a large majority (72%) do so sometimes, often, or frequently. Regionally, the least common of all the CIC's activities is teaching demonstration lessons. While no large number of CIC's in most states, value this activity, in one state (3) teaching demonstration lessons is considered to be among the five most effective activities of the CIC.

In most cases the frequency with which consultants perform their activities is commensurate with their evaluation of those activities. A comparison of frequency and evaluation shows, however, that consultants in the region participate regularly in the activities of professional organizations, regularly provide names of outside resource people, and occasionally prepare bibliographical listing, while very few consultants find these to be effective activities. In at least one of the states a number of consultants value the teaching of demonstration lessons, while in no state do a majority of the CIC's commonly undertake this activity.

Responses:

Vocational Division

The services of the vocational consultant are available to local and state department educators, administrators, and others upon request. The following table lists the sources from whom consultants receive requests for services. Regional and state frequency mean figures represent the consultants' perception of the frequency with which they receive requests from each of the sources listed.

SOURCES OF REQUEST

Vocational Education — State Comparisons - Mean Ratings

	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6
Teachers	4.22	4.30	3.75	4.63	4.30	4.22	4.00
Superintendents	3.68	3.50	3.25	4.00	3.80	3.67	3.83
Principals	3.47	3.40	3.25	4.00	3.50	3.56	3.00
Supervisors	3.16	3.10	4.50	3.25	3.10	2.00	3.17
Professional Organizations	3.12	2.80	2.75	4.50	3.30	2.67	3.33
S. D. Colleagues	3.10	2.50	3.38	3.50	3.50	2.56	3.33
Regulatory	3.06	3.70	2.38	3.50	3.70	2.22	2.50
Central Office Personnel	2.91	2.20	3.00	3.25	2.80	2.67	4.00
Colleges and Universities	2.87	2.20	2.88	3.38	3.10	2.78	3.00
Lay Groups	2.47	2.20	2.13	3.25	2.70	2.22	2.33
School Boards	1.90	1.60	1.63	2.25	2.00	1.56	2.67

Regionally, teachers and superintendents request the vocational consultant's services more frequently than do any of the other sources. There are four sources from whom most consultants sometimes or often receive requests for services, including principals, supervisors, professional organizations, and state department colleagues. Most vocational consultants are sometimes called upon by the State Department of Education to make regulatory visits and sometimes asked for services by central office personnel. Most consultants only occasionally or rarely hear from colleagues and universities and lay groups who request their services. The majority of vocational consultants rarely or never receive requests for services from school boards.

Teachers. The regional mean (4.22) and the means of all but one of the states show that most consultants frequently receive requests for services from teachers. In the five states teachers call upon the consultant for services more frequently than do any other source, by supervisors in one.

Superintendents. Consultants receive requests for services from superintendents at varying rates. A majority (29 of 51) either often or frequently receive requests from superintendents. Superintendents regularly call on most vocational consultants for aid.

Principals. There is also some diversity in the frequency with which requests come from principals. There is variety in each of the states, but the mean figures, ranging from 3.00 to 4.00, indicate that for most consultants, requests for services from principals come either occasionally or often.

Supervisors. There is considerably diversity in the frequency of requests from supervisors. Regionally the mean figure, 3.16, indicates that these requests come often. In four of the states most consultants either occasionally or often receive requests from supervisors. While there is variety from state to state, the majority of consultants in the region either occasionally or often receive requests for service from supervisors.

Professional Organizations. A large number of vocational consultants in the region (23 of 51) sometimes receive requests for services from professional organizations, while most of the remainder receive such requests either often (11) or rarely (9). Despite diversity, most of the vocational consultants in the region find that requests for services from professional organizations come on a fairly common basis.

State Department Colleagues. The regional mean figure, 3.10, and the state mean figures, ranging from 2.50, indicate that most vocational consultants often receive requests for services from state department colleagues. While a few vocational consultants rarely or never are called upon for aid by state department colleagues, most of the consultants in each of the states at least occasionally receive such requests.

Regulatory. There is considerable diversity with regard to the frequency of requests for the vocation consultant to make regulatory visits required by the state departments of education. While fifteen

of the fifty-one VEC's sometimes are required to make regulatory visits, seventeen VEC's rarely or never make these visits, and nineteen consultants often or frequently do so.

Central Office Personnel. Regionally, requests for services from central office personnel also vary greatly in frequency from one consultant to the next.

While there is considerable diversity from state to state, in only one of the states do most consultants regularly receive requests for services from central office personnel.

Colleges and Universities. Requests for services from colleges and universities are occasional for many vocational consultants (22 of 51). While the consultants are called upon for aid at different rates by this source, few of them in any state regularly receive requests for services from institutions of higher learning.

Lay Groups. For most vocational consultants, requests for services are seldom made by lay groups. While nineteen of the fifty-one VEC's in the region sometimes receive these requests, most of the remainder (26) rarely or never hear from lay groups that call for aid. In only one state, (3), does this vary.

School Boards. The source least likely to request the services of the vocational consultant is school boards. throughout the region and within each of the states, school boards seldom request the services of the vocational consultant.

Comparison of Directors' and Consultants' Perceptions
of Frequency of Requests for Vocational Consultant's Services

Source	Frequency Means		Diff. Exceed .50
	VEC (N=51)	Directors (N=6)	
Teachers	4.22	3.83	
Superintendents	3.68	4.17	
Principals	3.47	3.17	
Supervisors	3.16	3.00	
Professional Organizations	3.12	3.00	
S. D. Colleagues	3.10	3.17	
Regulatory	3.06	2.83	
Central Office Personnel	2.91	2.33	.58
Colleges and Universities	2.87	2.17	.70
Lay Groups	2.47	2.50	
School Boards	1.90	2.00	

There is little difference in the mean figures representing directors' and consultants' perceptions of the frequency of requests. While consultants more frequently are called upon for services by teachers than by superintendents, the directors' mean indicates the reverse of this order. Directors' mean figures also gave a higher incident of requests from central office personnel and colleges and universities than do the consultants who receive these requests. The differences here are slight; in most cases the directors appear to be aware of the frequency with which consultants receive requests for services.

With Whom Does the Consultant Work

Consultants work with a number of individuals and groups upon request. The table below lists those with whom the vocational consultant works as he performs his job and the relative frequency of this contact.

WORK WITH							
Vocational Education — State Comparison - Mean Rating							
	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6
Individual Teachers	4.41	4.60	4.13	4.75	4.30	4.44	4.17
Groups of Teachers	4.10	4.10	4.00	4.63	3.90	4.11	3.83
Individual Superintendents	4.00	3.80	3.38	4.38	4.20	4.11	4.17
Individual School Principals	3.82	3.50	3.88	4.13	4.10	4.00	3.17
S. D. Colleagues	3.77	3.30	4.38	4.38	3.90	3.00	3.83
Individual Supervisors	3.33	3.50	4.88	3.38	3.00	1.88	3.67
Professional Organizations	3.33	3.10	3.13	3.88	3.30	3.33	3.33
Groups from Colleges	2.75	2.40	3.13	3.00	3.00	2.11	3.00
Groups of Supervisors	2.70	2.70	2.88	3.00	2.70	2.00	3.17
Individual Central Office	2.67	2.50	2.38	2.88	2.10	2.67	4.00
Lay Groups	2.49	2.50	2.38	2.88	2.40	2.22	2.67
Groups of Principals	2.39	2.20	2.38	2.38	3.00	2.00	2.33
Groups of Superintendents	2.08	1.90	1.75	2.13	2.20	2.33	2.17
Groups Central Office	1.94	1.90	1.75	1.75	1.90	2.00	2.50
School Boards	1.88	1.55	1.63	2.25	2.00	2.00	2.00

Consultants work most frequently with teachers, individually and in groups. Vocational consultants regularly work with individual superintendents, principals, and state department colleagues; at varying but generally high rates consultants also work with state department colleagues and individual supervisors. Most consultants occasionally or often work with professional organizations, groups from colleges, groups of supervisors and individual central office personnel. Consultants occasionally work with lay groups, and groups of principals; and consultants seldom work with groups of superintendents, groups of central office personnel and school boards.

Individual Teachers. Regionally, consultants work most frequently with individual teachers; a majority of the vocational consultants (35 of 51) indicated that they work frequently with individual teachers. In all but one of the states a majority of the vocational consultants work frequently with individual teachers. Throughout the region and within each of the states nearly all consultants frequently work with individual teachers.

Groups of Teachers. With slightly less frequency consultants work with groups of teachers. A majority of the consultants (39) work with these groups either often or frequently.

Individual Superintendents. Regionally, vocational consultants work with individual superintendents almost as frequently as they work with groups of teachers. Individual superintendents are a regular working contact for most vocational consultants.

Individual Principals. Regionally, there is considerable diversity in the frequency with which consultants work with principals. The individual responses of the vocational consultants in the region are concentrated in areas of "sometimes," "often," and "frequently," (respectively 15, 19, and 14 of 51). Despite some diversity, most VEC's work regularly with individual principals.

State Department Colleagues. While there is some diversity in the frequency with which consultants work with state department colleagues, most of them work with their associates on a fairly regular basis. State department colleagues are a regular working contact with consultants in two states, while they are primarily an occasional working contact for the vocational consultant in the remaining four states.

Individual Supervisors. Respondents were almost evenly divided within the three highest rates, with 14 indicating that they work sometimes with individual supervisors, 13 often, and 11 frequently; the 13 remaining vocational consultants in the region either rarely or never work with individual supervisors. There is also considerable diversity from state to state as the mean figures, ranging from 1.88 to 4.88, would indicate. Regionally, as well as within most of the states, it cannot be determined how frequently the typical vocational consultant works with individual supervisors.

Professional Organizations. The majority of the consultants in the region indicated that they occasionally work with professional organizations (26 of 51); most of the remainder (19) often or frequently do so. The rate of frequency from state to state is rather uniform, as mean figures, ranging from 3.10 to 3.88, would indicate. Most vocational consultants appear to work with professional organizations on an occasional or slightly more frequent basis.

Groups from Colleges. The frequency with which consultants work with groups from colleges varies from consultant to consultant and from state to state. Most consultants work with groups from colleges on an occasional or less frequent basis, although nearly 20% of the vocational consultants do often work with these groups.

Groups of Supervisors. While there is some diversity in the frequency with which the vocational consultant works with groups of supervisors, the majority works with them rarely or only sometimes. Seventeen of the 51 consultants in the region indicated that they occasionally work with groups of supervisors; 16 work with them rarely; seven never work with them; and the 11 remaining VEC's either often or frequently work with groups of supervisors.

Individual Central Office Personnel

Most of the vocational consultants in the region work either occasionally or seldom with individual central office personnel. Seventeen of the 51 consultants indicated that they sometimes work with individual central office personnel; while 13 indicated that they frequently or often work with individual central office personnel, the remaining 21 indicated that they rarely or never work with these individuals. While there is considerable diversity in the frequency with which consultants work with central office personnel, most of them either only occasionally or rarely do so.

Lay Groups. Most consultants seldom work with lay groups, groups of principals, groups of superintendents, groups of central office personnel and school boards. A majority of the vocational consultants in the region (26 of 51) indicated that they rarely work with lay groups; 14 of the remainder indicated that they do so occasionally; 6 indicated that they do so often or frequently; and 5 VEC's showed that they never work with lay groups. The range of the state means, from 2.22 to 2.88, shows that the consultants in most states are in agreement. Lay groups are one of the least common of the vocational consultants working contacts.

Groups of Principals. Most VEC's either occasionally or rarely work with groups of principals. There is some diversity from state to state; in each of the states at least a plurality of consultants rarely or never work with groups of principals or do so only on occasion, while very few consultants in the region do so more than occasionally.

Groups of Superintendents. Most vocational consultants seldom work with groups of superintendents. In two of the states a plurality of consultants work with groups of superintendents on occasion while the remainder do so rarely or never. Throughout the region and within each of the states, the vocational consultant seldom works with these groups.

Groups of Central Office Personnel. As the regional mean figure, 1.94, indicates, most vocational consultants work with groups of central office personnel. As a rule consultants very rarely work with groups of central office personnel.

School Boards. Consultants work most infrequently with school boards. In all of the six states a majority of the VEC's indicated that they rarely or never work with school boards.

Comparison of Directors' and Consultants' Perception
of Frequency of Parties With Whom the Vocational Consultant Works

	VEC (N=51)	Directors (N=6)	Diff. Above .50
Individual Teachers	4.41	4.50	
Groups of Teachers	4.10	4.33	
Individual Superintendents	4.00	4.33	
Individual School Principals	3.82	3.83	
S. D. Colleagues	3.77	3.50	
Individual Supervisors	3.33	4.17	.84
Professional Organizations	3.33	3.17	
Groups from Colleges	2.75	2.83	
Groups of Supervisors	2.70	3.33	.63
Individual Central Office	2.67	3.33	.66
Lay Groups	2.49	3.00	.51
Groups of Principals	2.39	3.33	.94
Groups of Superintendents	2.08	3.33	1.25
Groups of Central Office	1.94	2.83	.89
School Boards	1.88	2.50	.67

The directors' and consultants' perceptions disagree by .50 regarding eight of the 15 frequencies assigned to those with whom the vocational consultant works; in all cases the directors gave higher frequency ratings to these individuals and groups than did the con-

sultant. While the differences between frequency means in these cases exceeds .50, for the most part the relative frequencies are in agreement. There are, for example, six parties with whom the consultant most frequently works, including individual teachers, groups of teachers, individual superintendents, individual school principals, state department colleagues, and individual supervisors. The directors' frequency means for these show that the directors also consider them the six most frequent of the consultant's working contacts, although they may not be quite in the same order.

While there are a number of cases in which the regional means for consultants' and directors' perceptions of frequency disagree, they probably reflect differences in frequency from state to state rather than a lack of awareness on the part of all of the directors in the region regarding the frequency of their vocational consultant's working contacts.

Methods of Contact

Consultants throughout the region employ five common methods in contacting the people with whom they work. The table below lists these methods along with the frequency mean indicating the relative frequency with which consultants employ them.

METHODS OF CONTACT

Vocational Education - State Comparison - Mean Ratings

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Personal Visit	4.61	4.60	4.75	5.00	4.50	4.56	4.17
Letters, Newsletters	4.39	4.30	4.50	4.88	4.20	4.33	4.17
Telephone	4.18	4.10	3.75	4.88	3.90	4.00	4.67
Team	3.16	2.70	3.25	4.00	3.30	2.44	3.50
ETV	1.65	1.50	1.13	1.63	2.30	1.78	1.17

The vocational consultant's most common method of contact is the personal visit. In all of the states a majority of the consultants responded that they frequently pay personal visits to those with whom they work.

Consultants also dispatch letters and newsletters frequently to the parties with whom they work. In five of the states a majority frequently sends letters and newsletters; in the remaining state (6) the majority does so either often or frequently. Letters and newsletters are used by the consultant as one of his most common methods of contacting the people with whom he works.

Consultants also frequently use the telephone as a method of contact. There is some diversity in the frequency with which consultants telephone from state to state. In four of the states, the mean figure range from 4.00 to 4.88, indicating frequent use of the telephone.

Team visits are a fairly common means of establishing contact. In the different states there is some diversity with regard to the frequency with which consultants pay team visits. With the exception of the vocational consultants in state 3, most of those in the region do not regularly pay team visits.

Educational television is uniformly the least frequently employed method of contact for the VEC. In all of the six states a large majority of consultants rarely or never use educational television as a method of contacting the people with whom they work.

Summary

Consultants frequently pay personal visits, write letters and newsletters and make telephone calls to those with whom they work. They occasionally or often group together to make team visits. Few consultants use educational television to contact local schools.

Comparison of Consultants' and Directors'
Perceptions of the Frequency of the VEC's Methods of Contact

	Consultants' Mean N = 51	Directors' Mean N = 16	Diff. Exceed .50
Personal Visits	4.61	4.33	
Letters, Newsletters	4.39	4.17	
Telephone	4.18	3.67	.51
Team	3.16	2.83	
ETV	1.65	1.83	

Only in one case are the mean figures at variance, in the use of the telephone, which the directors do not feel to be as frequent as the consultants indicate. The difference here is slight; directors are apparently aware that consultants regularly establish contact by paying personal visits, by writing letters and newsletters, and by telephoning. The directors are also aware that while consultants pay team visits on at least an occasional basis, the consultant rarely uses ETV as one of his methods of contacting the people with whom he works.

Follow-up Procedures

After establishing some kind of contact with the local schools, consultants employ any of several follow-up procedures in order to maintain this contact. The table below lists the relative frequencies assigned to each of the procedures by the vocational consultants who employ them in continuing their work with the local schools.

FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURES

Vocational Education — State Comparisons - Mean Ratings

	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6
Letters	4.31	4.30	4.50	4.75	4.20	3.89	4.33
Subsequent Visit	4.11	3.50	4.00	4.63	4.20	4.44	4.00
Informational Material	3.84	4.00	3.88	4.25	3.80	3.56	3.50
Telephone	3.61	3.33	3.50	4.38	3.50	3.67	3.33
Series of Subsequent Visits	3.35	3.20	3.25	3.50	3.60	3.56	3.00
S. D. Referral	3.18	2.90	3.38	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.50

None of the mean figures for any follow-up fall below 2.90. That these mean figures are generally high suggests that most consultants follow-up with some regularity their contacts with local schools.

Consultants most frequently follow-up by writing letters, with Letters being the most common follow-up procedure in the region.

Consultants also quite regularly follow-up by paying a subsequent visit. In all of the states the majority of vocational consultants interviewed said they often or frequently follow-up by paying a subsequent visit.

Most consultants also continue their relations with the local schools by sending informational material.

It would be difficult to establish the regional frequency for the use of the telephone. For most consultants, however, telephoning seems to be an occasional rather than a frequent follow-up procedure.

Consultants are not in agreement as to the frequency with which they make a series of subsequent visits. From state to state the frequency is also varied, with a plurality of consultants in either the "sometimes" or the "often" category, and with the remaining voca-

tional consultants scattered throughout the range of frequency. For most consultants paying a series of subsequent visits is at least an occasional follow-up procedure.

The case is similar with state department referrals. Most vocational consultants at least sometimes make state department referrals; some so do regularly.

In summary, as a general rule the vocational consultants regularly follows up his initial contacts with the local schools by writing letters, paying subsequent visits, and sending informational material. At varying rates, but at least occasionally, most consultants telephone, pay a series of subsequent visits, or make state department referrals.

Comparison of Consultants' and Director'
Perceptions of Frequency of Follow-up Procedures

	VEC (N = 51)	Directors (N = 6)	Diff. Exceed. .50
Letters	4.31	4.33	
Subsequent Visits	4.11	3.83	
Informational Material	3.84	3.83	
Telephone	3.61	3.50	
Series of Subsequent Visits	3.35	3.67	
S. D. Referrals	3.18	3.00	

There is very little difference between the consultants' and the directors' perception as the mean figures indicate. In all cases the directors appear to be aware of the relative frequency with which the VEC's employ their several follow-up procedures.

Evaluation Practices

Consultants were asked to record the extent of personal and departmental efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of their services. The table below gives the percentage of VEC responses in each of the four areas describing self-evaluation.

EVALUATION PRACTICES – PERSONAL

Vocational Education – State Comparisons - Response Percentage

	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6
None	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Limited	6	10	13	10	10	0	0
Moderate	42	40	63	63	40	33	0
Extensive	52	50	25	38	50	67	100

As the table indicated, the personal evaluative efforts of the VEC may be described as moderate to extensive. All of the consultants in the region indicated that they engage in at least limited self-evaluation. In two states the majority of the vocational consultants conduct personal evaluations of the effectiveness of their services to a moderate extent, while most of the remaining vocational consultants in these states do so extensively. In the four remaining states a majority of consultants (100% of them in 6) engage in extensive personal evaluation.

EVALUATION PRACTICES – DEPARTMENTAL

Vocational Education – State Comparisons - Response Percentage

	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6
None	8%	0%	18%	0%	10%	12%	5%
Limited	43	28	36	26	55	53	55
Moderate	36	39	36	47	25	29	40
Extensive	13	33	9	26	10	6	0

Departmental evaluations of the effectiveness of the Vocational consultants' services are not as extensive as are the consultant' personal evaluations. While at least some consultants in every state report extensive departmental evaluations, only in two states (1 & 6) do a majority of the consultants describe these efforts as being extensive.

The efforts of the state departments of education in evaluating the consultants services vary from state to state, even from consultant to consultant. They appear to range from limited to moderate to extensive, not being generally as thorough as are the consultant's personal efforts.

SCHEDULE DEVELOPMENT

Consultants were asked to report the manner in which they develop their schedules. The table below shows the percentages of respondents who employ each of the several methods of schedule development.

SCHEDULE DEVELOPMENT

Vocational Education — State Comparisons - Response Percentage							
	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6
	56%	70%	13%	63%	50%	88%	50%
Personal Development							
Personal and Submit for							
Approval	34	10	75	37	50	11	33
Developed for You	4	10	13	0	0	0	0
Other	6	10	0	0	10	0	17

As a general rule, the vocational consultants interviewed develop their schedules personally. In five of the six states of the region, a majority of the consultants develop their schedules themselves, independent of supervision. In the remaining state (2) a large majority of the consultants (75%) develop their schedules personally and submit them to someone else for approval; the majority of the instructional consultants in that state are also unique in the region in that they too develop their schedules personally and submit them to another for approval.

Most of the vocational consultants in the region (63%) develop their schedules personally. In all but one of the states a majority of the consultants are independent of supervision in scheduling their activities.

Frequency of Consultants' Activities

Consultants participate in a variety of activities when they work or prepare to work with the local schools. The table below lists these activities along with the frequency means indicating the incidence of consultants' participation in each of these activities.

ACTIVITIES - FREQUENCY							
Vocational Education - State Comparisons - Mean Ratings							
	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6
Visit and Observe in the Classroom	4.39	4.30	4.00	4.88	4.10	4.78	4.33
Assist in Planning of Work-Shop Activities	4.27	4.50	4.13	4.38	4.00	4.67	3.83
Participate in Workshop Activities	4.21	4.10	4.63	4.13	4.20	4.44	3.33
Assist in Development of Programs for Federal Funding	4.03	3.50	4.50	4.25	3.90	4.11	4.00
Participate in Activities of Professional Organ.	4.04	3.70	3.88	4.50	3.80	4.56	3.83
Participate in Orientation Programs for New Personnel	4.03	4.10	3.88	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.00
Assist in the Development of Curriculum Guides	3.84	4.10	3.88	3.63	3.90	4.22	3.00
Collect and Disseminate Current Curr. Inform.	3.76	3.50	3.38	4.63	3.60	4.11	3.33
Assist in Eval. other than Accred. & Standards	3.70	3.80	3.63	4.00	3.60	4.11	2.83
Write and Distribute Bulletins and Curr. Mat.	3.61	3.80	2.88	3.75	3.60	4.22	3.17
Assist in Accred. & Standards Program	3.53	3.30	3.88	4.00	3.40	3.66	2.83
Provide Names of Outside Resource People	3.55	3.10	3.75	3.75	3.10	3.88	4.00
Prepare Bibliographical Listing	3.33	3.50	2.63	3.50	3.60	3.44	3.00
Assist Textbook Selection Committee	3.11	2.90	3.13	3.25	3.00	3.56	2.83
Work with Citizens or Lay Groups	3.00	2.80	2.75	3.50	2.90	3.22	2.83
Arrange Inter-System Visitation	2.76	2.40	3.00	3.13	2.50	2.89	2.83
Teach Demonstration Lessons	2.38	2.50	2.25	2.13	2.70	2.44	2.17

There are eight activities in which most consultants in the region regularly participate. These include visiting and observing in the classroom, the most common activity of all; assisting in the planning of workshop activities; participating in workshop activities; assisting in the development of programs for federal funding; participating in orientation programs for new personnel; assisting in the development of curriculum guides, and collecting and disseminating current curriculum information. The concentrations of responses regarding the frequency of these activities occurred in the two highest categories, "often" and "frequently."

There are six other activities in which a number of consultants in the region commonly participate. These include assisting in evaluation other than accreditation and standards, writing and distributing bulletins and curriculum materials, assisting in accreditation and standards programs, providing the names of outside resource people, preparing bibliographical listing, and assisting textbook selection committees. The concentrations of responses regarding the frequency of these activities fell within the areas of "sometimes," "often," and "frequently."

Regionally, consultants work at varying rates with citizens and lay groups; the responses were spread almost evenly throughout the three middle rates of "rarely," "sometimes," and "often."

Most consultants in the region only occasionally or rarely arrange intersystem visitation and teach demonstration lessons. These are their two least common activities.

Visiting and Observing in the Classroom. Visiting and observing in the classroom is the most frequent of the vocational consultant's. The majority of the consultants in the region (30) frequently visit and observe in the classroom. Most of the remainder (16) do so often. It is interesting to note that while teaching demonstration lessons is one of the least frequent of the consultants' activities, for nearly all of the consultants in the region and in each of the states, visiting and observing in the classroom is a most regular activity.

Assisting in the Planning of Workshop Activities. Regionally, assisting in the planning of workshop activities is quite a common undertaking for most consultants. The majority of the vocational consultants in the region (44) either often or frequently assist in the planning of workshop activities. As the mean figures for each of the

states show, assisting in the planning of workshop activities is an activity in which nearly all of the consultants in each of the states either often or frequently participate.

Participation in Workshop Activities. Consultants frequently participate in as well as plan workshop activities. With the exception of the consultant in state six, most of the consultants in the region quite regularly participate in workshop activities.

Assisting in the Development of Programs for Federal Funding. Nearly half the vocational consultants in the region (23) frequently assist in the development of programs for federal funding. While there is some diversity from state to state with regard to the frequency with which consultants participate in the development of programs for federal funding, for most consultants this is a regular activity.

Participating in the Activities of Professional Organizations. A large majority of the vocational consultants in the region regularly participate in the activities of professional organizations. As mean figures for each of the states show, there is some diversity within the region. In three states the majority of VEC's often participate in the activities of professional organizations while most of the remainder do so frequently. In one state (1) there is considerable diversity. The plurality of consultants (4 of 10) sometimes participate in the activities of professional organizations. Two do often, three do so frequently, and one does so rarely. Regardless of the diversity with regard to the frequency of this activity, a majority of the vocational consultants either often or frequently participate in the activities of professional organizations.

Participating in Orientation Programs for New Personnel. Most consultants regularly participate in orientation programs for new personnel. While consultants engage in this activity at any of the three higher rates, nearly all of them do so often or frequently.

Assisting in the Development of Curriculum Guides. Most of the vocational consultants in the region regularly assist in the development of curriculum guides. This is the first of the consultants' activities to which more consultants' responded that they often participate rather than that they frequently participate. There is some slight diversity in the frequency of this activity from state to state. In five of the six states at least half of the VEC's often or frequently

assist in the development of curriculum guides while most of the remainder do so on occasion. In the remaining state (6) responses of the 6 vocational consultants in that state are evenly divided in the areas of "rarely," "sometimes," and "often." With the exception of state six, assisting in the development of curriculum guides is at least an occasional, more commonly, a regular activity for nearly all the VEC's.

Collecting and Disseminating Current Curriculum Information. Most of the vocational consultants in the region regularly collect and disseminate current curriculum information. While this is not a very frequent activity for the consultant in at least two states, in all of the other states, most consultants occasionally or regularly collect and disseminate current curriculum information.

Assisting in Evaluation Other than Accreditation and Standards. With varied frequency, consultants assist in evaluation other than accreditation and standards. The two most common rates for this activity are "often" and "sometimes." While 11 of the 51 consultants frequently assist in evaluation other than accreditation and standards, 21 do so often, and 15 do so occasionally. The concentration of responses falls in the area of sometimes and often. In each of the six states the majority of respondents indicated that they either often or occasionally participate in evaluation other than accreditation and standards, while nearly all the remaining vocational consultants do so frequently. Although there is some diversity in the frequency of this activity, nearly all consultants at least occasionally assist in evaluation other than accreditation and standards and most of the remainder do so on a regular basis.

Writing and Distributing Bulletins and Curriculum Materials. Writing and distributing bulletins and curriculum materials is a fairly common activity for most consultants in the region. Of the 51 consultants interviewed, 11 indicated that they frequently write and distribute bulletins and curriculum materials, 18 said that they often do, and 15 showed that they do so on occasion. Over 50% of the VEC's in the region participate in this activity often or frequently. In all of the states but two, (2 and 6) however, a majority of the vocational consultants often or frequently write and distribute bulletins and curriculum materials, while most of the remaining consultants do so on occasion.

Assisting in Accreditation and Standards Programs. For most of the consultants in the region, assisting in accreditation and standard programs is an occasional or common activity. The frequency with which consultants assist in accreditation and standards programs varies from state to state; within the region most of them do so occasionally or quite regularly.

Providing Names of Outside Resource People. There is some diversity in the frequency with which consultants in the region provide names of outside resource people. Fifty per cent of the vocational consultants often or frequently participate in this activity, while most of the remainder do so on occasion. Only in one of the states, (5) however, did a majority of consultants show that they frequently or often provide names of outside resource people. In the remaining states, the concentration of responses fell in the categories of sometimes or often, with the remainder spread in the other categories. While there is considerable diversity in the frequency of this activity, for nearly all consultants it is at least an occasional activity and for half of them it is a common undertaking.

Preparing Bibliographical Listing. Preparing bibliographical listing is an occasional activity for many consultants. Others participate in it at varying rates. Preparing bibliographical listing is not a regular activity for most consultants, although a number of them do participate in this activity on occasion.

Assisting Textbook Selection Committees. Consultants do not seem to follow any general rule with regard to the frequency of assisting textbook selection committees. The responses were distributed within the five frequency areas. While consultants assist textbook selection committees at varying rates, a number of them in the region do so often or on occasion.

Working with Citizens or Lay Groups. Consultants show the greatest diversity with regard to the frequency of their work with citizens or lay groups. Of the 51 vocational consultants interviewed, four each never and frequently work with citizens or lay groups, 13 each rarely and often work with citizens or lay groups and the 17 remaining consultants do so sometimes. In none of the six states does there seem to be any pattern to the responses; they are spread throughout the five categories indicating that consultants work with citizens or lay groups at varying, usually moderate rates.

Arranging Intersystem Visitation. Arranging intersystem visitations is not a common activity for most consultants in the region.

Teaching Demonstration Lessons. Teaching demonstration lessons is the least frequent of all the vocational consultants activities. Over 50 per cent of the consultants (27 of 51) rarely or never teach demonstration lessons. All of the remainder do so on occasion (19), or often (5). In four of the states the majority of the consultants rarely or never teach demonstration lessons, while in the two remaining states (4 and 5) the majority do so on occasion while most of the remainder rarely or never do so.

Comparison of Directors' and Consultants' Perceptions
of Frequency of Consultants' Activities

Activity	Frequency Means		Diff. Exceed. .50
	Vocational Consultants' (N= 51)	Dir. (N = 6)	
Visit and Observe in the Classroom	4.39	3.67	.72
Assist in the Planning of Workshops	4.27	4.67	
Participate in Workshops	4.21	4.67	
Assist in the Development of Programs for Federal Funds	4.03	4.17	
Participate in the Activities of Professional Organizations	4.04	4.33	
Participate in Orientation Programs for New Personnel	4.03	3.33	.70
Assist in the Development of Curriculum Guides	3.84	4.67	.83
Collect and Disseminate Current Curriculum Information	3.67	4.17	
Assist in Evaluation Other than Accreditation and Standards	3.70	3.67	
Write and Distribute Bulletins and Curriculum Materials	3.61	4.00	
Assist in Accreditation and Standards Programs	3.53	3.33	
Provide Names of Outside Resource People	3.55	3.17	
Prepare Bibliographical Listing	3.33	3.83	
Assist Textbook Selection Committees	3.11	3.33	
Work with Citizens or Lay Groups	3.00	3.00	
Arrange Inter-System Visitation	2.76	2.67	
Teach Demonstration Lessons	2.38	2.00	

A comparison of the consultants' and the directors' perceptions of the frequency of vocational consultant activities shows the directors are, for the most part, aware of the time which the consultants spend on their various activities. Only in three cases do the mean figures differ more than .50. Directors do not seem to be aware that consultants so frequently visit and observe in the classroom or participate in orientation programs for new personnel. On the other hand, the directors misjudged the frequency with which consultants assist in the development of curriculum guides, an activity which is not as common for the vocational consultants as their directors indicated. In all other cases the directors seem to be unusually well acquainted with the relative time which consultants allow for their many different activities.

Evaluation of Activities

After indicating the frequency of their activities, the consultants were asked to check from this list, the five activities which they found to be the most effective. The table below shows the percentages of VEC's in each of the states and in the region who consider each of the activities to be among their most effective

ACTIVITIES – EVALUATION

Vocational Education – State Comparisons - Selection Percentage*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Visit and Observe in the Classroom	78%	80%	63%	63%	90%	89%	83%
Participate in Orientation Programs for New Personnel	56	50	38	63	50	67	67
Assist in Planning of Workshop Activities	56	50	50	63	50	78	50
Assist in the Development of Curr. Guides	52	50	38	38	80	44	50
Assist in Eval. other than Accred. & Stand.	44	20	50	50	50	67	17
Assist in Development of Programs for Federal Funding	34	40	50	25	40	11	33
Participate in Workshop Activities	34	40	63	50	0	22	33
Collect & Disseminate Current Curr. Inform.	24	30	13	38	0	22	50
Arrange Inter-System Visitation	20	0	13	50	10	22	33
Work with Citizens or Lay Groups	16	20	13	25	20	11	17
Participate in Activities of Prof. Organ.	14	20	13	13	10	22	17
Write & Distribute Bulletins & Curr. Mat.	12	40	13	0	20	0	0
Teach Demonstration Lessons	10	10	0	13	30	0	0
Assist in Accred. & Stand, Programs	8	10	13	0	10	0	17
Assist Textbook Selection Committee	6	10	0	0	0	22	0
Provide Names of Outside Resource People	6	0	0	13	20	0	0
Prepare Bibliographical Listing	4	10	13	0	0	0	0

*Selections were limited to five choices by each individual.

Consultants are not in agreement on the effectiveness of all their activities. There are, however, five activities which a majority of consultants in most of the states consider to be the most effective. These include (1) visiting and observing in the classroom, (2) participating in orientation for new personnel, (3) assisting in the planning of workshop activities, (4) assisting in the development of curriculum guides, and (5) assisting in evaluation other than accreditation and standards. There are four other activities which at least one-fourth of the consultants in most states consider to be effective. These include assisting in the development of programs for federal funding, participating in workshop activities, collecting and disseminating current curriculum information, arranging inter-system visitation. There are four other activities which between 10 and 20 per cent of the vocational consultants generally consider to be effective. These include working with citizens or lay groups, participating in the activities of professional organizations, writing and distributing bulletins and curriculum material and teaching demonstration lessons. The remaining four activities are seldom found by any consultants to be of value. These include assisting in accreditation and standards programs, assisting textbook selection committees, providing names of outside resource people and preparing bibliographical listing.

Visiting and observing in the Classroom. More consultants consider visiting and observing in the classroom to be an effective activity than any other. Seventy-eight per cent of the vocational consultants in the region find this to be a valuable undertaking, while no less than 63% of the consultants in any of the states and as many as 90% in one of the states value this activity.

Participating in Orientation Programs for New Personnel. A majority of the vocational consultants in the region consider participating in orientation programs for new personnel to be one of the most effective activities. In five of the six states, at least 50% of the consultants value participating in orientation programs for new personnel. In the remaining state (2) 38% of the consultants value this activity.

Assisting in the Planning of Workshop Activities. A majority of the vocational consultants in the region (56%) consider assisting in the planning of workshop activities to be one of the most effective of the consultants undertakings. In all six of the states at least 50% of the consultants value this activity.

Assisting in the Development of Curriculum Guides. Assisting in the development of curriculum guides is the last activity which a majority of the consultants in the region find to be effective. Fifty-two per cent of the vocational consultants interviewed value assisting in the development of curriculum guides. In three of the states at least 50 per cent of the consultants value this activity; in one state (4) 80 per cent of the consultants consider this to be an effective activity. In the three remaining states (2, 3, and 5) nearly 50 per cent of the consultants in each state value assisting in the development of curriculum guides.

Comparison of Consultants' and Directors' Evaluation of
Vocational Consultants Activities

Activity	Selection Percentages		Diff. Exceed. 25%
	Vocational (N = 51)	Directors (N = 6)	
Visit and Observe in the Classroom	78	50	28
Participate in Orientation for New Personnel	56	33	
Assist in the Planning of Workshop Activities	56	67	
Assist in the Development of Curriculum Guides	52	83	31
Assist in Evaluation Other than Accreditation and Standards	44	67	
Assist in the Development of Programs for Federal Funds	34	17	
Participate in Workshops	34	33	
Collect and Disseminate Current Curriculum Information	24	50	26
Arrange Inter-System Visitation	20	17	
Work with Citizens or Lay Groups	16	0	
Participate in the Activities of Professional Organizations	17	17	
Write and Distribute Bulletins and Curriculum Materials	12	33	
Teach Demonstration Lessons	10	0	
Assist in Accreditation and Standards Programs	8	17	
Assist Textbook Selection Committees	6	0	
Provide Names of Outside Resource People	6	0	
Prepare Bibliographical Listing	4	0	

The directors' and consultants' evaluations of the vocational consultants activities are in agreement in most cases. The five activities which more vocational consultants value than any other include visiting and observing in the classroom, participating in the orientation of new personnel, assisting in the planning of workshop activities, assisting in the development of curriculum guides, and assisting in evaluation other than accreditation and standards. The five activities which more directors value than any others include all but one of the above; more directors value collecting and disseminating current curriculum information than participating in orientation programs for new personnel.

While only 24% of the consultants consider collecting and disseminating current curriculum information an effective activity, 50% of their directors find this to be one of the consultant's most productive activities. More directors also value assisting in the development of curriculum guides than do consultants. While 52% of the consultants find that assisting with curriculum guides is an effective activity, 83% of their directors regard it as effective. On the other hand, fewer directors value visiting and observing in the classroom than do consultants. More consultants (73%) value this activity than any other; many directors (50%) consider visiting and observing in the classroom to be an effective activity of the consultant, but more directors value other activities, including planning workshops, developing curriculum guides, and assisting in other evaluation.

It should be recalled that consultants gave a higher frequency rating to visiting and observing in the classroom and to participating in orientation of new personnel than did directors; more consultants find these to be effective than do the directors. Consultants also gave a lower frequency rating to assisting in the development of curriculum guides and to collecting and disseminating current curriculum information than did directors. More directors find these activities to be effective than do consultants. The consultants' and directors' evaluations of the vocational consultant's other activities appear to be comparable.

Comparison of Consultants' Perceptions of Frequency and Effectiveness of Activities

The responses of the vocational consultants have established the relative frequencies with which these consultants perform activities as they work or prepare to work with local schools. The consultants have also registered their evaluations of the effectiveness of these activities. The following table compares the consultants' perceptions of frequency and effectiveness.

Vocational Consultants

(N = 51)

Activity	Frequency Mean	*Evaluation Selection Percentage
Visit and Observe in the Classroom	4.39	78%
Assist in the Planning of Workshops	4.27	56%
Participate in Workshops	4.21	34%
Participate in the Activities of Professional Organizations	4.04	14%
Assist in the Development of Programs for Federal Funding	4.03	34%
Participate in Orientation of New Personnel	4.03	56%
Assist in the Development of Curriculum Guides	3.84	52%
Collect and Disseminate Current Curriculum Information	3.76	24%
Assist in Evaluations Other than Accreditation and Standards	3.70	44%
Write and Distribute Bulletins and Curriculum Materials	3.61	12%
Provide Names of Outside Resource People	3.55	6%
Assist in Accreditation and Standards Programs	3.53	8%
Prepare Bibliographical Listing	3.33	4%
Assist Textbook Selection Committees	3.11	6%
Work with Citizens or Lay Groups	3.00	16%
Arrange Inter-System Visitation	2.76	20%
Teach Demonstration Lessons	2.38	10%

The consultants' most frequent activity is visiting and observing in the classroom, the activity which more consultants regard as effective than any other. The activity second in frequency and second in the number of consultants considering it effective is assisting in the planning of workshops. Of the four remaining activities which are the most frequent of the vocational consultants, participating in work-

shops, participating in the activities of professional organizations, assisting in the development of programs for federal funding, and participating in the orientation of new personnel, only the last of these (with a selection percentage of 56) is among the consultants' five most effective activities. Although a number of consultants (34% in both cases) value participating in workshops and assisting in the development of programs for federal funding, neither of these very frequent activities is among the consultant's five most effective. Participating in the activities of professional organizations (mean 4.04) is the fourth of the vocational consultant's five most frequent activities. While a large majority of the consultants in the region (75%) regularly participate in the activities of professional organizations, only 14% of them consider this to be among the five most effective activities.

On the other hand, while a number of consultants value assisting in the development of curriculum guides (selection percentage 52) and assisting in evaluations other than accreditation and standards (selection percentage 44), neither of these activities, although they occur with some regularity, is among the most frequent of the vocational consultant.

In most other cases the consultants' perceptions of the frequency and effectiveness of his activities are in relative agreement. It is apparent, however, that the vocational consultant values some infrequent activities highly and frequently participates in some activities which he does not consider to be effective.

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Satisfying Incident

Dissatisfying Incident

Drawbacks

Dreams / Profections

Satisfying Experiences

Effecting Change at the Local Level

The most common source of consultant satisfaction is effecting change at the local level, through in-service, consultation, or other means. Of the 197 satisfactory experiences recounted, 177 of them derived from effecting change at the local level. Consultation seems to be the most rewarding of the means by which such change is accomplished; 95 consultants mentioned consultation as a rewarding experience, 49 mentioned in-service, and 30 recounted other productive means of effecting change at the local level.

In four of the six states consultants expressed their pleasure with seeing in-service meetings bring about change in teaching methods, enthusiasms for new subject matter, and other program advancements. In five of the six states helping set up workshops and seeing attitudes change as a result of in-service were satisfying experiences for the State Department of Education consultant. In every state a number of consultants were gratified with in-service work and with favorable reaction to and interest in workshops.

Consultation was frequently mentioned throughout the region as a source of satisfaction to the SDE consultant. In three states consultants expressed their pleasure with experiences involving assisting local schools with special programs and seeing their efforts to meet accreditation and standards aid the schools. Their participation in pre-planning and assessing sessions was satisfying to consultants in four of the states. It is not surprising that in every state consultants mentioned that they take pleasure in seeing their recommendations, demonstration, and suggestions put into practice. Such a response is further evidence that the State Department of Education consultant in the Southeastern region considers himself an agent of change and feels motivated to improve conditions in the local schools.

Consultants mentioned a number of other satisfying experiences which aid in effecting change at the local level. In four of the six states many consultants looked favorably upon experiences involving the development of materials. Seeing students who had obviously benefited from their programs was gratifying to consultants in four states also. In every state seeing schools develop was recounted as one of the State Department of Education consultant's most satisfying experiences.

Other areas in which consultants experienced satisfaction include receiving recognition, enjoying stimulating peer relationships, and participating in orientation and state department in-service programs. In five states consultants expressed satisfaction with recognition of their work, and in three states with recognition for having been of service to local personnel. In three states consultants were pleased with their working relationships with state department colleagues. In two states consultants expressed their gratitude for the opportunity to receive in-service training or orientation which they later profited from in their work in the field.

Dissatisfying Incidents

Following the question on satisfying experiences, the consultants were asked to recount typical frustrating experiences they had encountered in their work. The question was worded as follows:

"We have all had experiences so unsatisfying or frustrating that we would like to forget them. Can you tell me of such a time in your work as a state department consultant?"

The answers to this question followed the form of the satisfying experiences. While the greatest source of consultant satisfaction involved effecting change at the local school level, the greatest source of dissatisfaction results when consultants' efforts do not bring about such change. Of the 180 frustrating experiences recounted, 119 concerned the consultants' failures to effect change, 31 concerned frustrating state policies, and 29 concerned adverse working conditions.

The first general category of dissatisfying incidents concerns failure to effect change. Failure to effect change was blamed either on poor local cooperation or on the consultant's own lack of preparation. Throughout the region there was 105 references to incidents of poor local cooperation, and 14 references to the consultants' own unpreparedness resulting in frustrating experiences.

The most widespread local factor credited with frustrating the consultants' efforts to effect change was a lack of administrative support. In all of the six states of the region consultants mentioned incidents of failure in their efforts to bring new programs. Such failure was due to improper management of these programs or an apathetic or unconcerned school administration that did not give the consultants' program the support needed for success.

Three other similar dissatisfying experiences are common to consultants in five states. These incidents result from a lack of preparation and planning by local teachers and officials, indifference, apathy, or a lack of receptiveness, and a lack of adequate local staff.

All three of these factors result in frustration for the consultant who sees his efforts to work with the local schools end in failure.

In four of the states, consultants were frustrated by experiences which indicated to them that certain local educators conceived of the

consultant as a critic rather than a resourceful advisor. The local educators' suspicions and fears of the consultant make the consultants' task more difficult.

In two states consultants mentioned dissatisfying experiences deriving from encounters with poor local leadership. Such incidents may involve the failure of school boards or school administrators to gain support for a program the consultant feels is badly needed in the system.

These incidents indicate that consultants are often dissatisfied with people at local level who refuse to consider alternatives to methods which the consultants feel are unsatisfactory, who consider the alternatives but fail to profit by them, and who refuse to accept the recommended changes which the consultant feels are vital. Local cooperation would appear to be essential to the consultants' success: consultants are rewarded when they encounter cooperation from local educators, and they are frustrated when they fail to receive such cooperation.

Another factor which 14 consultants in the region mentioned as frustrating their efforts to effect change at the local level is the consultants own unpreparedness. In all six states there were references to consultants being called on to do something for which they were unprepared. In four states consultants related frustration experiences which derive from the consultant being supplied with inadequate background information to prepare him to meet the particular needs of the local schools.

The second general category of consultants' dissatisfying experiences is comprised of frustrating or restrictive state policies. Consultants in all six states recounted dissatisfying experiences resulting from a lack of planning and followup at the state level. These consultants were frustrated because they felt they had not received adequate support from their state departments in outlining their objectives and following through with them. Consultants in five states lamented the fact that they had experienced failures resulting from inadequate state orientation programs. In four states poor department organization was mentioned as a source of consultant dissatisfaction. Although not as numerous as complaints concerning the failure to effect change at the local level, complaints about state policies are frequent enough to indicate that among consultants there is some dissatisfaction with support from the department level.

The third general category of consultants' dissatisfying experiences concerns working conditions. Of the 180 frustrating experiences, there were 29 which indicated that consultants are dissatisfied when adverse working conditions prevent them from reaching their goals. Most of the complaints concern resources; consultants mentioned inadequacies of space, time, staff, communications, and funds. The most widespread frustration, mentioned in all six states, results from a lack of time.

Some consultants feel that they are so harried with work that there is not enough time for them to do the kind of jobs they would like to do. Others feel that they are handicapped by having to waste time on trivia and on travel, when they could be doing more important things. In five states consultants mentioned three other dissatisfying experiences related to working conditions. Consultants in these states are dissatisfied with poor communications between their offices and the local schools or within the department, with having to cover too large a geographic area to give them the opportunity to form closer associations with the local personnel whom they advise, and with inadequate funds for travel and for materials. In four states consultants are frustrated because they feel that their staff is too small to accomplish its goals, and in three states consultants feel there is not ample space in which to work.

Consultants in every state mentioned frustrating incidents involving poor local cooperation, restrictive state policies, and adverse working conditions. The majority of the dissatisfying experiences occur as consultants encounter uncooperative local personnel who impede the consultants' efforts to effect change in the schools. Although a few consultants said that these incidents made them bitter or sick, most consultants viewed these experiences positively, saying that they were prompted to plan more thoroughly, rely less on others, make appropriate changes in approach, and try again harder.

DRAWBACKS

Following the section on dissatisfying experiences, consultants were asked to discuss drawbacks they had encountered in their work. The question was raised as follows: "What are some of the things that slow you down in your work or prevent you from doing all the things which you would like to do as a consultant?" Many consultants mentioned drawbacks which were similar to the frustrating experiences they had encountered in their work. The most common drawback concerns coordination of activities. Of the 456 specific drawbacks mentioned, 144 involved coordination of activities, 80 involved problems with staff, 79 with working conditions, 77 with local school conditions, 56 with departmental organization, 50 with money, and 10 with training for the state department staff.

The most frequently mentioned drawback results from poor coordination of activities. This poor coordination was generally blamed upon a lack of time or authority, poor resources and poor communication. In all of the states, consultants mentioned the fact that they did not have enough time to adequately coordinate their activities. Also, in six states, consultants detailed drawbacks resulting from a lack of coordination and communication in the State Department and its divisions. In five states, consultants complained of lack of proper role definition, citing examples of overlapping authority and improper job descriptions. In four states, consultants blamed poor coordination of activities upon the lack of follow up procedures which effectively supplement the consultants initial efforts with local schools. In three states, consultants mentioned a lack of direction, commitment, or adequate philosophical approach as a stumbling block in their work as consultants. In two states, consultants lamented both their lack of knowledge of the local school system and a lack of authority as deficiencies preventing them from performing their jobs as they desire. That so many consultants encounter stumbling blocks as their work overlaps, conflicts with, or duplicated the work of other consultants points to weaknesses in the system by which their activities are coordinated.

Second in number to drawbacks involving poor coordination of activities or drawbacks involving staff, there are 80 specific references to stumbling blocks blamed on inadequate staff. In every state, consultants mentioned a lack of staff as one of the things that prevented them from achieving their goal. To these consultants there does not seem that there are enough consultants to carry the work load. In

three states, consultants lamented the fact that there are not enough specialist on the department staffs. A lack of staff seems to be one of the more wide-spread of the consultants drawbacks.

The third most common drawback concerns working conditions. Seventy-nine specific references were made to drawbacks involving adverse working conditions. In five of the states, consultants lamented the fact that there was too great a geographical scope for them to adequately cover and that they lacked sufficient clerical help to free them for more important duties. In four states, consultants cited too much paper work as one of the working conditions which they find disagreeable.

In five of the states, consultants indicated that time wasted in travel prevented them from devoting themselves fully to the more important aspects of their jobs. In three states, consultants in inadequate office facilities express their dissatisfaction with the lack of privacy and space in which to work or with the lack of equipment and materials needed to perform their jobs. In two states, consultants sent back that offices were spread out across the state and this constituted a stumbling block for them. In one state, consultants mentioned as a stumbling block difficulty with the telephone in placing WATTS line calls. Many consultants praise this service as an excellent way of communicating with local personnel.

The fourth area in which stumbling blocks were mentioned comprises local school conditions. Specific references were made to drawbacks encountered at the local level. Consultants expressed their dissatisfaction with the support from local school administrators. In four states, consultants were dissatisfied with inadequacies in areas of funds and facilities, and interest and enthusiasm on the part of teachers and administrators for these programs. In these states, consultants felt that their programs were not as successful as they should be because local personnel either were not available in sufficient numbers or were not adequately trained to conduct an effective program; that teachers lack the interest and enthusiasm to upgrade their methods; or that adequate funds and facilities were not available. In two states, consultants expressed dissatisfaction with three kinds of stumbling blocks. These consultants were unhappy with pressures and prejudices which added drawbacks to their programs. In two other states, consultants cited as an example of a stumbling block the failure of school personnel to make necessary changes in program approaches, and in two other states, consultants were dissatisfied with lack of preparation at the local level for consultant visits.

Departmental organization in the fifth area in which consultants encountered stumbling blocks. The most wide spread of these drawbacks involves inadequate organization at the department level. In all six states, administrative and regulatory policies which consultants viewed as restrictive; the consultant acknowledges that a certain amount of administration was necessary, felt that the consultant is often restricted by a rigid and elaborate departmental structure or over organization. In all six states, consultants complain of red tape and bottle necks which cause delays and limit efficiency. While in a number of states there were complaints of lack of delegated authority. Four of the states consultants were dissatisfied by the lack of clear policies that they could follow in their work. In three states, consultants expressed their dissatisfaction in the fragmental departmental organization and expressed a need to work as teams.

Insufficient funds cause a stumbling block to a number of consultants. There were fifty specific references to money as a cause for drawbacks in the consultants job. In every state, consultants expressed their dissatisfaction with a lack of funds to carry through their programs properly. In five of the states, there was considerable dissatisfaction with the lack of travel money. Consultants were displeased with the travel allowance, some to the extent that they felt financial hardships. In three of the states, consultants voiced their disapproval of low salaries. In these states, consultants were concerned that the low salary scale hindered their department in recruiting competent staff members and that there was a possibility that the department could be faced with a very high turn over rate in personnel.

Last area of consultants drawbacks concerns training for state department staff. There were only ten references to stumbling blocks involving inadequate training. In five of the states, consultants expressed a need for orientation in the department. In three states, consultants said that in-service training was necessary. And in one state, consultants complained of inadequate pre-service training and a lack of state department commitment to the professional growth of the consultants role.

DREAMS AND PROJECTIONS

Following the section on consultant stumbling blocks, consultants were asked to outline their dreams and projections for the role of the consultant in the future. The question was expressed in the following terms: "We have all thought at times, if I had enough money, time, help, etc., I would do this my way. What kinds of things would you do if you were not restricted in any way? What are your dreams?"

Stimulated by this question nearly all of the 170 consultants interviewed gave lengthy responses. There were 423 specific suggestions or dreams, an average of more than 2 per consultant. Some consultants exhibited that they had engaged in considerable long range planning, while others showed that they had been unable to project beyond immediate problems. Of the 423 dreams recorded, 305, or almost 75%, concern state department changes. A smaller number, 83, involve local school changes; 26 dreams were concerned with the development of innovative programs; 9 of the consultants projections addressed themselves to changes in higher education.

The most frequent of the consultants dreams concerned state department changes. These projections often followed closely with the consultants prior references to dissatisfying experiences or drawbacks, and often took the form of solutions to impediments in the consultants job. Consultants recommend state department changes in the areas of staff, staff training, working conditions, utilization of media and materials, program approaches, evaluation and research, and funding. In every state, consultants called for increased staff and for the hiring of specialist as solutions to problems they had encountered or as means of up-grading the services of the state department consultant. In three of the states, consultants suggested that the state department hire regional consultants, making it possible for the consultant to have a more intimate relationship with the local school personnel with whom they work.

Improved staff training was another of the state department changes suggested by the consultants. In five of the states, consultants recommended that the state department provide in-service training for consultants so that they might improve their competency on the job. Also, in the same five state, consultants recommended that the state department provide for more travel experience for the consultant sending him to model systems both within the state and throughout the nation, in order to acquaint the consultant with

developments within his field. Providing orientation was another projection of the consultants in their dream for state department changes.

Working conditions seems to be another area in which the consultants find room for improvement. In five states, consultants discuss the need for state departments to provide better facilities for the consultant, and for more clerical help to free the consultant from paper work so that he can do more important tasks. In three of the states, consultants suggested that improved salaries would up-grade the services of the state department consultant. In two states, consultants expressed a need to improve communications, both within the department and from the department level to the local system level.

Media and materials was another area in which consultants dream of state department changes. In five of the states, consultants call for a greater use of media in reaching local schools. In three states, consultants looked to development of materials as more effective means of providing consultant services. In two of the states, consultants call for improvements in educational television and for increased use of the ETV systems in those states.

Program approaches was another area in which consultants sought state department changes. In every state, consultants call for various changes in approach and for expansions in existing programs. In four states, consultants suggested that the state department might profit by examining programs, in reviewing the approaches which may or may not be effective. In four other states, consultants voiced the feeling that more experiment was needed in the programs of the state department consultant.

Consultants also called for changes in state department involving evaluation and research. In four of the six states, consultants suggested that the state department would profit by providing the consultant with time for research and evaluation in his specific area of competency.

Just as funds have been blamed for a number of dissatisfying experiences and drawbacks, funds appeared in a number of the projects of the consultants concerning state department changes. In five of the state, consultants called for more funds for travel, salaries, and program approaches.

The second general category of consultant projects involves planning and improvement at a local level. As with the state, though, the consultants felt a need at the local school level for improvements in staff, staff training, and working conditions.

In five of the six states, consultants called for increased staff at the local school level and for a higher level of competency on the part of those hired by local schools. Also in those five states, consultants recommended that local schools hire supervisors to provide teachers with much needed service.

The universal area for improvement involves staff training. In all of the states, consultants called for improved in-service and improved pre-service training of local school staffs.

Consultants also made a number of recommendations concerning improved working conditions at the local level. In every state, consultants suggested that programs would improve when local schools were provided with better facilities. In five of the states, consultants recommended that local schools improve salaries in order to get more effective performance from their staffs.

The third general area of consultants dreams concerns innovative programs. There were 26 specific innovative programs mentioned by consultants; most of these programs concerned the establishment of centers for pilot projects. In every state, consultants saw the need for the establishment of media or lab centers as needed resource and training centers. In five states, consultants recommended that state department establish demonstration centers to acquaint local educators with developments within their fields. Also, in five states, consultants recommend that resource centers be established. In every state, consultants called for the development of experimental schools which could be resources both for teachers and consultants, who might visit and observe innovations which could be applied in other areas. In four states, consultants recommended that a profitable innovation would be the development of pilot projects.

There were only a few references to higher education in the projects in the state department consultants interviewed. Of the 423 specific dreams and projections, only nine of these referred to developments in higher education. In five states, consultants called for the improvement of pre-service training at the college level. While in only one state, consultants call for the expansion of graduate schools.

CONCLUSION

After carefully studying the information presented in this report, many conclusions can be drawn. It is readily obvious that the modus operandi of the instructional consultant differs somewhat from that of the vocational consultant. Furthermore, the responses to the open-ended questions indicate that there is a great deal of agreement among the consultants of both divisions regarding the kinds of experiences they have had. They consider themselves change agents, and it is satisfying to them to bring about change. They are frustrated when they are unable to effect change at the local level. The drawbacks they encounter range from lack of time and money to changes they see need for in the department. And, they dream and project — some royally and creatively, some pedantically and short-sightedly.

It would be impossible for a research specialist to take these data and say — "This is an effective consultant, the attitudes he should have, and the activities he performs and values." It is not impossible, however, to take these data and compare them with other evaluation of the work of state department consultants and reach some personal conclusions as to directions for improvement and change.

This regional report, as stated in the introduction, does not propose a regional consultant. Rather, it presents this information from a regional point-of-view, in the hope that it will be of help to individual state departments of education as they continually attempt to improve their working relationships with local schools.